DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 279 SO 020 253

AUTHOR Stephens, Lester; And Others
TITLE Social Science Review: Consultants' Report and Recommendations.
INSTITUTION State Univ. System of Florida, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE Jun 88
NOTE 242p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anthropology; Curriculum Evaluation; *Demography; Educational Assessment; Higher Education; *History; Institutional Research; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Social Sciences; *Sociology
IDENTIFIERS *State University System of Florida

ABSTRACT

A group of consultants conducted a program review to evaluate the quality of social science programs in the state university system of Florida and made recommendations for improvements within the existing resource base and about program needs should new resources become available. An overview of social sciences in the system is followed by sections on anthropology, history, and sociology. In these sections, an overview of the statewide system is followed by an examination of individual programs in the specific disciplines at each of the state's universities. The program assessment is followed by a section on general and interdisciplinary social science programs at some of the universities and a discussion of a master's degree program in demography at Florida State and a proposed doctorate in applied social science at Florida A & M. An examination is made of the undergraduate and graduate experience and the faculty, and concerns are noted in each area. Recommendations are made for the statewide system and for each individual program. Seven appendices contain information on the consultants, a list of five statewide issues, an academic degree program inventory, and a staff analysis that highlights the central issues in the social sciences in the state university system of Florida and includes recommendations to the state board of regents and each university. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313279

SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CAROL WADE
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO022253

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

JUNE, 1988

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

CONSULTANTS' REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

by

Lester Stephens

Art Gallaher

Russell Dynes

Accepted by the Board of Regents August 26, 1987

State University System of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida

BOR 87-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA..... 1

I. Introduction..... 1
II. The Undergraduate Experience..... 5
III. The Graduate Experience..... 13
IV. The Faculty..... 16
V. Recommendations..... 18

ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA..... 21

SUS OVERVIEW..... 23

I. Introduction..... 23
II. The Undergraduate Experience..... 26
III. The Graduate Experience..... 28
IV. The Faculty..... 30
V. Recommendations..... 31

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS IN ANTHROPOLOGY..... 33

University of Florida..... 35
University of South Florida..... 41
Florida State University..... 47
Florida Atlantic University..... 52
University of Central Florida..... 56
University of West Florida..... 60

HISTORY IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA..... 65

SUS OVERVIEW..... 67

I. Introduction..... 67
II. Recommendations..... 74

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS IN HISTORY..... 79

University of West Florida..... 81
University of North Florida..... 83
University of Central Florida..... 86
Florida Atlantic University..... 88
Florida International University..... 91
University of South Florida..... 94
Florida A&M University..... 97
Florida State University..... 101
University of Florida..... 105

SOCIOLOGY IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA..... 109

SUS OVERVIEW..... 111

I. Introduction..... 111
II. The Role of Sociology in the University..... 112
III. Sociology in the Professional Schools..... 114
IV. Research and Funding for Research..... 115
V. Faculty Development..... 117
VI. Sociology in the SUS..... 117
VII. Recommendations..... 118

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS IN SOCIOLOGY..... 119

Florida State University..... 121
University of Florida..... 124
University of Central Florida. 127
University of South Florida..... 130
Florida International University..... 133
Florida Atlantic University..... 136
University of West Florida..... 139
University of North Florida..... 141
Florida A&M University..... 143

MASTER'S IN DEMOGRAPHY PROGRAM AT FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY..... 147

GENERAL AND INTERDISCIPLINARY SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS
IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA..... 153

Florida State University..... 155
University of South Florida..... 156
Florida Atlantic University..... 156
Florida A&M University..... 157
University of Central Florida..... 158
University of West Florida..... 158

THE MASTER OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM AND PROPOSED
PHD OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCE AT FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY..... 161

APPENDICES..... 169

A. Abbreviated Curricula Vitae of Lead Consultants for Anthropology, History, and Sociology..... 171
B. List of Local Consultants..... 211
C. List of University Coordinators..... 215
D. Statewide Issues..... 219
E. Academic Degree Program Inventory..... 223
F. Site Visit Schedules for Individual Universities..... 227
G. Staff Analysis and Recommendations..... 255

STAFF NOTE: The consultants were asked to conduct a program review which would evaluate the quality of the programs and (a) to make recommendations for improvement within the existing resources base and (b) to make recommendations about program needs in the event that new resources were to become available. The recommendations which appear were developed within these guidelines.

OVERVIEW OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

Art Gallaher

I. Introduction

While history represents one of the oldest disciplines in the intellectual tradition that we label Western Civilization, anthropology and sociology were only emerging prior to the nineteenth century. Since that time, however, all three have assumed full-partner status in systems of higher education throughout the West and, indeed, most of the rest of the world. It is fitting and proper, therefore, to find them in strong form and general good health in the State University System of Florida (SUS).

The social sciences are as a special mirror that we have invented to look at ourselves in our infinite variety. One glance reveals the broad sweep of where we have been to where we are now, the substance of history; another calls up an equally broad image of society--perhaps only a single institution or problem therein--the grist of sociology; and still another broadly focuses those ideas and conceptions that the members of a human group create and impose upon nature and themselves--what we call culture--the purview of anthropology. Though not included in this review, if called upon, our special mirror can narrow its focus even more to reveal political science, economics, geography, international relations, and other disciplines included typically under the label of social sciences. And, as is true of all mirrors, while the images that capture us sometimes are flattering, at others they are not so complimentary. Thus the degree of welcome accorded these disciplines in

places of learning--except for history--has varied considerably over the years. It might be useful to explore, if only briefly, this phenomenon.

Of all the social sciences, history, more than any other, is historically and otherwise self-justified to membership in the academy. In simplest terms, its relevance derives ultimately from the premise that each of us is an historian--of one's self, of one's family, and of one's group--creating and recreating a picture of the past as each of us sees it against contemporary life and our changing conception of individual needs. Indeed, one need never look far to hear this common sense posture argued so fervently as to give first impression of advocacy of an extremist position. Extremist, however, it is not. Quite the contrary, it represents conventional conception of the past as a storehouse of wisdom for the conduct of life, and since the future continues to be difficult to know, piety demands one to respect that wisdom. How to use the past for enlightenment, not to be frustrated and coerced by it, and to make it relevant to human behavior in the present, is, of course, the primary task of the academic historian. And while this task may be appreciated at one time more than another, the issue is never whether history is a part of the academy, but rather more one of emphasis and/or priority. This does not mean, of course, that the staff of history is immune to conflict, because it is not. How can it be otherwise when our consultation with the past, and our rehearsal of that past on ritual occasion, relate always to present-time anxieties and preoccupations? It may well be thus that our interest in the past is something less than our concern for the future, especially since the latter, as Lawrence Frank noted some time ago, is only a name given to altered states of the present.

The greening of anthropology and sociology in the fields of academe was not, in their early days, without some trauma. That their acceptance followed

on paths similar to those of the earlier development of the natural sciences, and for some of the same reasons, made their travail no less burdensome. Put simply, the raw material of the social sciences is drawn from the everyday life of all of us, and where there was elementary and simple logic to lead one to appreciate history in its formative years, the same held neither for anthropology nor sociology. In fact, the avowed objective of each to understand human social and cultural behavior, not merely to know it, fouled one of the oldest logical fallacies of the time--since human beings learn only from experience, their behavior is not otherwise understandable nor in any fashion predictable! The inherent dilemma noted here brings to mind Alfred North Whitehead's observation, in his THE ORGANIZATION OF THOUGHT, that "Everything of importance has been said before by somebody who did not discover it." Early sociologists and anthropologists thus labored mightily against the claim that their business amounted to nothing more than "discovery" of what others already knew, a charge still heard occasionally from uninformed quarters.

The rapid integration of sociology and anthropology into the curriculum of secondary and tertiary level institutions followed, and was partly a consequence of, the Second World War. The crisis in world affairs precipitated by that singular event, and the accompanying effort by human societies world-over to get their respective houses in order, caused thinking people everywhere to face the human relations disciplines for help. In our own country, for example, the war left giant tears in our social fabric, and these released generation, ethnic, and racial issues with such force as to reel the whole of culture and society.

Not always popular in the early days of such conflict, the social sciences did, nevertheless, prevail in the view that likenesses and differences among and between human populations everywhere are to be understood

equally. Indeed, this simply stated proposition, though complex to actualize, may well be the general education linchpin that students ought to take with them from even the most casual brush with the social sciences. It is, as in the nature of educated people everywhere, an essential first step to breaching dogmatism and, especially, to overcoming an attitude that refuses to see any problem because the answer is evident without investigation. This calls to mind a point that shall be discussed later but which deserves its moment now, namely, projection of the multicultural society for Florida that issues so frequently from the System's excellent document, Quest for Excellence: THE MASTER PLAN of the State University System of Florida, 1985 Update. There is nothing of principle to quarrel with in the kind of society envisioned there; rather, properly conceived in ground that fosters appreciation for cultural and racial difference, it should be one of great vigor and tone, and is sure to bring to the SUS envy the world over for having brought it off.

Enough has been said to establish that social science fortunes, largely because of their sensitive subject matter, are likely to ebb and flow with the nature of society's concerns. Since students bring these concerns with them to the university, similar movement also occurs, though with less emotion, inside the academy. With his accustomed good sense in these matters, Dr. Russell Dynes, the lead consultant for sociology has made the point effectively:

> During the period of time when vocationalism has been high in higher education, the social sciences have been dismissed as irrelevant to vocational goals. During the period of time when vocationalism has been low, the social sciences have been dismissed as "easy" to account for high student interest. During the period of time when traditional and classical educational value have been in ascendance the social sciences have been discussed as non-traditional and faddism. During the period of time when "scientific" values are in ascendance, the social sciences have been dismissed as unscientific and common sense.

This rhythm of coming and going informs the analyses of all local and lead consultants who participated in this evaluation: appearing now as explanation of an enrollment history; now as anxiety for one's place in general studies or core curricula; next as paranoia in perceptions of appreciation that follow on the allocation of any resource, tangible or intangible. However, the pattern of support for social science that followed the Second World War, and which continued to its peak in the early nineteen seventies, followed the same course in the State University System of Florida as in the rest of the country. This time represents, of course, the most socially conscious ever in our society, when contradiction, paradox, and social issue were scribed painfully into our cultural map. The Viet Nam conflict, while devastating, served mainly to exacerbate a process already underway and not to be denied, one tormented by self-depreciation and indecision.

Since the early nineteen seventies our society has tilted sharply away from the wrenching self-examination implied in the above, replacing it by an almost equally obsessive, but psychologically more comfortable, concern to reassert our technological dominance in the world community. And we are, indeed, in the midst of just such a movement, but unlike previous industrial revolutions, which were manpower and natural resource driven, this one is driven by knowledge. Indeed, the management of knowledge and its control is emerging as <u>the</u> major commodity in contemporary human societies. It is against this background, then, that we shall examine history, sociology, and anthropology in the State University System of Florida in 1987.

II. The Undergraduate Experience

Well over one hundred years ago, as he assumed rectorship of the new University of Dublin in Ireland, Cardinal John H. Newman defined the university in Western Society as follows:

> (A university is) a place of concourse, whither students come from every quarter for every kind of knowledge.... Where inquiry is pushed forward and discoveries verified and perfected, and rashness rendered innocuous, and error exposed, by the collision of mind with mind, and knowledge with knowledge.

This powerful definition places correct emphasis: the business of the university is knowledge, meaning all of the associated creative processes required to generate, store, and disseminate it. For our purposes, at the most elementary level the university deals with two kinds of knowledge: (1) that which is the business of everybody, acquired through general education, and comprising those conventional understandings shared by those who claim status as educated persons; and (2) that which is not everybody's business, comprising those concentrations shared by those who claim the same baccalaureate or graduate degree. It is convenient for purposes of discussion in the present context to separate these two knowledge bases, and that is the course we shall follow.

General Education:

That part of the undergraduate curriculum that we conceptualize as general education, meaning, as noted above, that which ought to be the business of everybody, should always draw its relevance from the future-time perspective. In terms most practical, then, those who see to such things in universities must develop--indeed require students to experience--programs that connect those elements from our past to our present which best ensure advantage in the management of one's future. Part of the business of general

education, then, is continuing attention to best inform the direction that the future will take. And since accuracy, even in the view of tomorrow, is at risk, it is imperative that one's eye follow trend rather than sophistic postulate.

In the Florida case, there is a commendable document for which the Regents can take considerable credit and much pride. This reference, of course, to the 1985 Update, Quest for Excellence: THE MASTER PLAN of the State University System of Florida. This document delineates major trends in the state, some of which are extensions of idiosyncratic history, and are perceived, therefore, to be unique; others, rooted in the present, are nurtured by events in the nation; and a smaller number, take their import from the international community. Whatever their origin, the identification of such trends is an excellent benchmark against which to assess the efficacy of general studies programs in the state's system of higher education.

In line with what has just been said, it is worthy of note that local and lead consultants are as one in finding too little effort in Florida institutions to conceptualize general education models that will meet contemporary student needs. This does not mean there is neither conversation nor thought given to the issue, because there is. The Consultant's concern turns rather on the need to accelerate modification of existing programs, and especially on the need for innovation that more explicitly anticipates the future needs of the students. In some institutions, for example, one is left with the feeling that general education still is captive to upper division and graduate program priorities; in still others, one feels faculty and administration are tentative on the issue, legacy, no doubt in some, of the recent past, when lower division students belonged somewhere else. In line with the latter observation, and to be fair to all institutions in the system, it is

important to introduce the following caveat: consultants believe it is difficult, at best, to manage general education effectively in a predominantly 2+2 system, where experiential integration depends first, on the substantive congruity of courses, and second, on their quality. Suffice to say, opinion as to how dependable these two variables now are across the state system of higher education varies widely.

There are several objectives noted in the 1985 update of the state's master plan, referred to above, that hold special significance for the three social science programs under review. In Chapter 2 of this plan, under the section headed "Trends in Education," workshop conferees note their expectation that university experience will leave graduates with "the hallmarks of an educated person: a zest for learning, a skeptical awareness of all that is yet to be learned, and a commitment to the pursuit of truth." This very laudable expectation is followed elsewhere in this document by further, and appropriate, expectation that universities will "develop a core curriculum that emphasizes the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in a "high-tech" society--especially mathematics, science, English, computing, and foreign languages." Again, the expectation is laudable and is tied, as probably intended, to the more general expectation noted already under "hallmarks of an educated person...." In both of the above, concerns run to the substantive content and skills which, given our best judgement at the moment, should be part of that kit of tools to ease every educated person's coping behavior into the future. And on this point, one probably should have to go far to find some quarrel.

Both of the above expectations are obvious kindred to the concept of an "information society," referenced several times in THE MASTER PLAN document. And, it is this context--"information society"--that leads to the question of

how much more than substantive content, and skills defined mainly in computational and linguistic terms, should be included in a contemporary-oriented general studies program. At issue, of course, is the nature of the social organization that will drive a society where information is the major resource, a resource unlimited, that can be used, subdivided, and consumed without ever being depleted. We are, in fact, with our modern technology, adding enormous quantities of such information daily to our own storehouse, a process being repeated simultaneously in several other societies of the world. We may, in fact, be nearing in some areas what Varian Gregorian, the historian who heads New York City's magnificent public library system, projects as an impending mental grid-lock--where mounds of information will grow faster than our ability to manage processes for their storage, retrieval, and conversion into knowledge. Without belaboring this complex issue in the current context, it is necessary, however, to leave you with the point that conversion of information to knowledge is a major responsibility of the modern university, a task that requires people prepared to do it, and who have access to technology that will enable the analysis prerequisite to the discovery of knowledge.

More to the point in the present context is that the issues just raised have enormous implications for students, and for how universities prepare them to deal with the future. There is, first of all, the problem of attitudes about learning, knowledge, and career, helped little by too many having spent too many pre-college years being rewarded more for memorization and obedience than for intellectual growth. Further, the common perception of education as a series of ritually capped terminal experiences ill prepares one to adapt successfully to the dynamics of an information-based society. Viewed in simplest possible terms, today's freshman classes in our universities face a future in which knowledge possession will be a norm of higher value than

during any previous period in history; where continuing knowledge acquisition will be a norm and a necessity; where multiple career shifts in one's lifetime will be common practice; and where one's surrounding society will change so rapidly that those who have no comprehension of the process will be disoriented. This is a heavy burden for change to lay on our entering freshman classes, and it is a heavy burden of responsibility to put before our universities. Among other implications, it forces greater attention to the matter of substantive content to be got into our students, clearly the piece of the puzzle that gets most of our attention, in the State University System of Florida or elsewhere.

Special Concerns:

(1) Of equal, perhaps even greater, importance, however, are the changes in perspective noted above. And while one should not think this burden assumable entirely by the general education experience, it is suggested here that this is the place to start. Further, consultants believe the social sciences to have a vital role in communicating the substantive and contextual environment of our society's move toward an information-based social organization, and to assist all to understand the implications that flow from that organization (See Recommendation A).

It is necessary to turn our attention now to another important set of expectations that recur throughout the 1985 version of THE MASTER PLAN. In several places it mentions the perceived need for Florida students to develop an appreciation for cultural diversity, both for pragmatic reasons of international business and for the practical reasons of now living in a multicultural society. The tone of the document, that Florida's multi-ethnic environment is a thing of strength, and is, therefore, to be valued, is commendable. While more explicit recommendation on ethnicity is reserved for

the graduate experience section, consultants note here that attitudes and values supportive of the posture desired should receive attention in both general studies and baccalaureate programs. They note further that the three disciplines under review should have major responsibility for understanding and communicating the sociocultural and historical context of same. Of particular concern to consultants in this regard, then, is the low profile of anthropology and sociology in some existing core and/or general studies curricula. Local institutional politics and internecine warfare aside, they are being ignored in a system that espouses cultural diversity and social and cultural pluralism as legitimate enterprise, should be corrected post haste. All consultants agree that the three faculties under review stand ready to make themselves useful in the general studies enterprise, and commend these faculties for claiming such interest through conviction of disciplinary worth rather than mere desire to secure more full-time student equivalencies.

There are other concerns and issues pertaining to the role of the social sciences in the general education experience proposed in each of the state's universities. However, since these concerns relate more generally to each of the disciplines under review, comment is thought better placed in each of the respective sections.

The Baccalaureate:

Degrees at this level in these three social sciences generally are not occupationally specific in the true disciplinary sense. To become "professional" in each of the disciplines most often requires the Ph.D., though a lesser number of possibilities exist in each for placement at the master's level. In this scheme of things, then, the baccalaureate degree for one who desires professional status is mainly an indicator of one's potential for graduate study. On this count, consultants at all levels of the evaluation

report general satisfaction with the content and quality of the baccalaureate programs in all institutions. Each program can, in fact, show evidence of success in the placement of its products in graduate degree programs elsewhere.

In addition to the population seeking the baccalaureate degree for entry to graduate programs, there are students who major, or select a minor, in the arts and sciences, as preparation for entry into the job market as liberal arts graduates. With the strong vocational interest previously noted, there are fewer young students than one might normally expect in this group; the decline in that population, however, is offset by the increasing number of older students who seek the university to satisfy special interest or alternative leisure style.

Discussion with current students and alumni, representing both of the populations indicated, reveal general satisfaction with the quality of the education received. Such discussion also supports a strong general education role for these programs. For example, graduates convey strong sentiment on the worth of the social sciences in sensitizing and sharpening a host of what can be labelled "people skills." This refers, of course, to observation, communication, and listening technique, all important in any station in life that requires human interaction. Of special note, too, students stress their awareness of, and sensitivity to, the subtleties of ethnic differences and gender relationships, attributing personal gains in each of these areas to their social science experiences.

It is the consultants' view, therefore, that social science is being reasonably well taught on all campuses in the State University System; and that baccalaureate programs meet the needs of students with both special and casual interest.

Special Concerns:

(1) Against the very favorable baccalaureate picture painted above, consultants are concerned that the service expectations of some small-faculty disciplinary units cause them to be over-taxed, with damage possible to baccalaureate program integrity. This issue runs to two circumstances: (1) when legitimate demands of the social sciences by professional schools are introduced into staffing patterns that are already marginal; and (2) when multidisciplinary programs are permitted to cannibalize the disciplinary resource base. (See Recommendation B)

There are other concerns and suggestions made in particular disciplinary contexts. These appear in the sections devoted to each.

III. The Graduate Experience

Each disciplinary evaluation included in this exercise makes the point that the social sciences, as viewed through these three disciplines, are reasonably well represented in the state's university system. Graduate programs exist in number and variety adequate to meet both market and student demand, with no significant duplicative efforts noted not justified by circumstance or program level. Noted and commended, despite declining numbers and accompanying support constraints, programs in all institutions demonstrate currency in disciplinary direction. There is, in fact, much imagination in the three faculties under review, and as a consequence program modifications, within the constraints imposed, have proceeded reasonably well. Consultants believe these programs to have done well by the state, given limitations, natural and otherwise, with which they have had to cope.

The disciplinary reports suggest a condition of at least temporary stasis in the development of new programs in these three areas. Limited employment

options for those seeking professional opportunity in them, observed by most consultants, are not expected to ameliorate until well into the nineties, when demographic trends indicate an upturn in university student numbers. The situation as just described, then, is one that calls for fine-tuning existing programs rather than considering expansion at either the M.A. or Ph.D. levels. In this regard, there are suggestions a plenty in the individual disciplinary reports, with most running to program, program support, and facilities issues.

There are many issues that the consultants believe to be of special concern at the state level. The first of these is the matter of access, an issue that surfaced repeatedly during the evaluation, usually, though not always, in the context of graduate program availability.

Special Concerns:

(1) Of special concern to consultants is the apparent total lack of appreciation by advocates of the conditions necessary to ensure quality programs and their maintenance. The practical implications of this political syndrome are to over-extend units, in some cases already understaffed, to branch campuses; in others, to create programs which, under present circumstances, the state seems unable to afford, and for which there is inadequate demand. Consultants sense a depressing lack of compromise on this issue (See Recommendation D).

Another issue runs to the 1985 update of THE MASTER PLAN and the concern therein that students graduating from Florida universities have some appreciation for the state's ethnic diversity. As social scientists who have viewed the multiple cultures of Florida from afar, and who have greater appreciation of the dynamic there as a result of this evaluation, it is apparent the state has much to say on this issue: probably no major city in the world achieved a bilingual, culturally pluralistic, state in such a short time as Miami.

Surely there is something to be learned and disseminated of this process, and to be applied perhaps to other ethnic situations in Florida, where relations seem to be building stress. The time may thus be right for the creation of a genuinely multidisciplinary center for the study of ethnic relations, with Miami the most likely locale for such effort (See Recommendation I). Core elements in such center should be the human relations disciplines--anthropology, sociology, and psychology--with others in supporting roles. While the center's interests should be centripetally focused, where appropriate it should reach out to national and international opportunities. It may well be that this is an idea whose time has come, and one that fits well into the state's projected future.

Special Concerns:

(1) Evidence generated in the evaluations cause consultants to question the wisdom of inter-institutional degree program arrangements. Those that exist show little basis for success, and there is little enthusiasm voiced in any quarter for their continuation or elaboration. The same attitudes supporting the access issue contribute to the negative side of the joint-institution degree concept (See Recommendation C).

(2) In all but the three major institutions in the state, consultants detect considerable ambivalence in the faculty over research versus teaching priorities. Involved here, though not the only issue, is the change in mission of the regional institutions, away from restricted upper division status to the gradual incorporation of lower division applicants (See Recommendation E). Equally confusing to faculty is the encouragement received for research in some institutions; but when the process is invoked, there is no institutional apparatus in place to assist with the procurement of grants and contracts.

(3) Consultants are impressed with the extent to which faculty are doing research, especially in some of the smaller institutions, under very adverse circumstances. In this regard, it is important to note that funding sources available to the social sciences are few compared to those that support the physical and biological sciences. The concern, therefore, must be to encourage the development of research incentives within the narrow constraints that do exist. A centrally coordinated policy to liberalize the principal investigators' participation in the distribution of indirect costs. This is an innovation that might be possible. The current situation in some institutions is that of disincentive for serious research effort, and is, no doubt, tied to the faculty's concern that the teaching/research priority be clarified (See Recommendation E).

IV. The Faculty

The professional profile of each of the faculties under review reveals generally a professoriate professionally qualified from the best graduate institutions in the country; they are properly attending to the business of teaching and research, including publication; and they are performing creditable to outstanding service for local, regional, national and, in some cases, international constituencies. These faculties convey a very strong work ethic and, for the most part, a remarkably strong loyalty to the institutions that have appointed them. It is apparent to consultants that they seek involvement; they want their respective universities to be successful. It is with some concern, therefore, that lead consultants note in their disciplinary reviews that faculty involvement in the decision-making apparatus of some institutions is not well defined. While this is not a major problem necessarily requiring systems-wide policy, it is mentioned in the present

context as illustrative of the need for better communication generally between administration and faculty. Lack of understanding of an institution's budget policy, or of its overall financial condition, is a refrain too often heard from faculty quarters. Improvement on this score might reduce levels of conjecture, inference, and innuendo.

There are faculty-related issues that ought properly to be of system concern. For example, in visiting departments over the state, one is left with a number of impressions: except for anthropology, there are too few women faculty; there are too few minority faculty, whether ethnic or racial in origin; and all faculties are reasonably young. On the first two counts, simple suggestions, such as to appoint more women and more minorities, can be made, with full understanding on the part of consultants that variables unknown to them may make such suggestions complex. Even so, the seriousness of the issues requires that all who are involved should be urged to keep trying, and further that this be a conscientious effort.

The issue of age grade, however, is of a different order, and one that requires solutions of the same genre. What is involved here is a chemistry that runs as follows: relatively young faculties previously characterized by high mobility, which, for a variety of reasons, are now relatively stable, on the one hand, and changing societal norms on the appropriateness of forced retirement and related issues, on the other. This is a situation that demands imagination and innovation now to ensure imagination and innovation in the future. In other words, it requires rather immediate attention to the issues of faculty development and of faculty renewal. Consultants are as one in noting too little focus now on these issues in the Florida system. One further and related note, the problems of longevity in position are compounded

by small-faculty units in many universities, and especially for those located physically in the more remote areas of the state (See Recommendation F).

Special Concerns:

(1) While the charge to consultants clearly states that recommendations are to assume current budget constraints, all agree it is imperative to mention the serious spread between salary levels in the Florida system and those of comparable faculty elsewhere. This problem is compounded by occasional serious understaffing, as measured against the program effort being attempted, and is a definite problem in maintaining morale (See Recommendation H).

Other recommendations pertaining to faculty appear in the disciplinary reports that follow.

V. Recommendations

A. That the BOARD OF REGENTS include in its expectation of the general studies experience some focus on students (1) learning how to learn, (2) learning how to think, and (3) learning how to adapt to a rapidly changing society;

B. That the BOARD OF REGENTS claim the integrity of disciplinary units as a principle to (1) guide the development of multidisciplinary programs, and (2) assess the service obligations of such units;

C. That the BOARD OF REGENTS not encourage further development of inter-university graduate degree programs in the social sciences;

D. That the BOARD OF REGENTS not encourage the development of branch campuses without the infusion of resources to make, and keep, them competitive with parent campuses;

E. That the BOARD OF REGENTS clarify relative research and teaching priorities of those institutions now in transition to four-year undergraduate status;

F. That the BOARD OF REGENTS develop systemwide programs for faculty renewal and development;

G. That the BOARD OF REGENTS continue to encourage institutions to appoint more women and minority faculty;

H. That the BOARD OF REGENTS make the recruitment and maintenance of faculty a top priority; and

I. That the BOARD OF REGENTS initiate a feasibility study for the development of a multidisciplinary ethnic relations center in the Southeast Florida region.

ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

Art Gallaher

SUS OVERVIEW

Preface:

Before proceeding, however, one caveat is much in order: The lead consultant would like to recognize considerable contribution of the local consultants who made intensive analysis of each campus and who so graciously responded to my many queries and suggestions with aplomb, thoroughness, and good humor. If there are mistakes made in this exercise, the criticism is mine and not to be visited on them.

I. Introduction

From its beginnings, the discipline of anthropology has been popularly called "the study of man." And true to that label, those called anthropologists have combed the world over, searching for explanation of the uniformities and diversities in mankind's natural condition. They take with them a perception of man as a figure against the ground rather than as a figure within a ground, that is, as a phenomenon peculiarly human, whose nature it is to be variable, but predictable within broad limits, and to be understood only through his own feelings and reactions. The central concept which guides and integrates this understanding, as noted in the introductory overview, is CULTURE, which refers to all of those ideas and conceptions that the members of a human group create and impose upon nature and themselves. The investigation of mankind's capacity for culture, and all the implications that flow from that, occurs in the sub-discipline called physical anthropology; understanding mankind's culture prehistory is the pursuit of

archaeology; cultural anthropology deals with contemporary cultures and how they function; and anthropological linguistics is concerned with the relationship between language and culture. These four sub-disciplines comprise the whole of anthropology, with introduction to the lot typically formatting baccalaureate degree preparation or, as in the case of each, serving as general studies preparation for non-anthropology majors. The objectives described here are true of each institution in the State University System (SUS) that offers a program in anthropology.

Anthropology as a formal discipline appeared in the academy of this country in the late nineteenth century, and somewhat sporadically in the State of Florida as early as 1925. Prior to the end of the Second World War, less than 300 professional anthropologists were employed in the United States, mainly in universities and colleges, with virtually all having received their graduate education from a small number of institutions in this country and England. However, circumstances associated with the 1940s war years and immediately thereafter--particularly exotic Pacific-theatre cultures previously unknown to most Americans--called attention not merely to the substance of anthropology but also to its potential for assisting solution to a variety of real-world problems. Symbolic of this discovery, Margaret Mead's name became an established element in the household lexicon of most Americans. There followed a period of rapid expansion, mainly in universities and colleges in the western world, and surely abetted in this country by the millions of veterans, now in college, who were no strangers to cross-cultural experience, and who now were more than curious about where they had been. This group ensured its succesion in the academy by its own prolificacy, the "baby boom" legacy of the sixties, whose drive for liberation melded nicely with the basic tenets and philosophy of anthropology.

The late fifties through the early seventies thus saw anthropology expand in this country and abroad, mainly in universities, where doctoral programs spawned more doctorates driven to spawn more doctoral programs. It was as though the academic market place projected an infinity filled with opportunity. By the mid to late seventies, however, several processes began to converge: demography caught up and the student numbers began to go down; and, as noted in the introductory section, our society at about this time started its tilt away from an intense concern with social issues to a reaffirmation of its traditional interest in technocracy. As this happened, interest of students in general education, and especially in the policy relevant disciplines represented in the social sciences, anthropology included, waned. In its stead, materialistic values--supporting possibly the strongest vocational commitment yet made by students in American higher education--assumed primacy. This trend, as true of the State University System of Florida as elsewhere in the country, is marked in Florida, as elsewhere, by enrollment downturn in all program levels, a declining interest of students in anthropology baccalaureate and graduate degrees, and a closing-in of the academic marketplace. The major response by anthropologists to these trends has been to reassert an interest in, and claim to, status in the general education of university students, and to give greater emphasis to one of its long-standing concerns, the application of anthropological findings, theory, and methods to the solution of human problems. THIS NATIONAL TREND, not incidentally, HAS BEEN CAPTURED IN VARYING DEGREE BY EACH INSTITUTION OFFERING AN ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAM IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA. As an item of information, some projections indicate that full demand for anthropology in the classroom, and for anthropologists in the universities of this country, will reappear in the early nineteen nineties.

With this brief trend statement in mind, we shall turn our attention now to anthropology in the State University System of Florida. The report will follow the same format as that developed in the introductory overview, that is, examine the role and contribution of anthropology to the undergraduate and graduate experience of students in Florida institutions, look at the quality and orientation of the various anthropology faculties, and conclude with recommendations.

II. The Undergraduate Experience

General Education:

Anthropology faculties in the State University System express strong commitment to the concept of general education. Further, they believe that exposure to the anthropological perspective --CULTURE--should be part of one's general education experience; indeed, that the virtue of that experience lies mainly in its challenge to the conventional folk wisdom commonly held of the nature of mankind, and to those biases derivative therefrom. Put simply, anthropologists hold that possession of the concept of culture leaves one with an experience more liberating than probably any other acquired on the path to becoming an educated person. Given the ethnic composition of the State of Florida, and given the priority extended to international trade and commerce for this region in the future, the significance of anthropology's involvement in the effort to develop citizens prepared for their future holds little room for question.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultant questions the adequacy of the general education curricula in some institutions to meet the State's objectives of a plural society and ethnic understanding and appreciation.

Lest one think cross-cultural understanding is all that anthropology has to offer a general studies curriculum, undergraduate students--non-majors and majors, current and alumni--in several universities expressed appreciation for a wide variety of coping skills acquired through their courses and professonial mentoring. These skills focus maninly in human relations activities, particularly those dealing with listening, observing, and communicating, both verbal and written. Added to these, students also credit general education anthropology courses with causing them to "think," and even better, with causing them to be more "analytical" of the world around them.

The Baccalaureate:

Each of the programs offering the B.A. degree in anthropology provides students with broad exposure to the field of anthropology. All define their mission on this point as exposure to the four sub-disciplines that make up the whole, and all are true to that mission. Further, each unit can document that its graduates have competed successfully for entry into graduate departments elsewhere. Of particular note, most baccalaureate curricula, combined with the instructional mode found in most units, expose students to the practical application of anthropological subject matter. It is noted that smaller departments seem generally to do a better job of advising. Enthusiasm for baccalaureate level activity is noted for both faculty and students. Library facilities generally are adequate for this level of instruction.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants suggest that programs with few faculty and small numbers of students need periodic infusion of new ideas and materials that might come through colloquia, visiting speakers, etc.

(2) Consultants are concerned that faculty development opportunities are not readily available for faculty in small departments with heavy service responsibilities.

(3) Consultants note that instructional facilities, audiovisual materials, and consumable supplies are inadequate for some programs.

III. The Graduate Experience

There are two Ph.D. degree programs in the State University System, one at the University of Florida and one at the University of South Florida; joint efforts exist between the University of Florida and Florida State University, and the University of Florida and Florida Atlantic University, but they are opted so seldom by students as to be virtually nonfunctional. The UF and the USF programs are both excellent, have good to excellent faculty, and each has as many students as it can sensibly handle. The UF program is diverse and expansive, incorporating both conventional and applied specialty tracks, whereas the USF program claims distinction as one devoted exclusively to nonacademic preparation. Of significant note: THE PH.D. PROGRAMS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA AND THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA ARE NOT DUPLICATIVE. Further, it is the consultants' view that NO ADDITIONAL PH.D. PROGRAMS CURRENTLY ARE NEEDED.

Master of Arts degree programs are offered at the University of Florida, the University of South Florida, Florida State University, and Florida Atlantic University. All offer solid curricula and, except for Florida Atlantic University, have adequate numbers; FAU's program continues to be small, causing some problem for the level of student/faculty interaction one would like. It should be kept in mind, however, that the department has only four faculty members. Each of the master's level programs can document the

success of its students competing for entry into status doctoral programs elsewhere; and two of them, Florida State University and the University of South Florida, appear to have unusually strong placement experience for M.A. graduates. It is worth noting that the University of Florida and the University of South Florida both offer strong curricular options in applied anthropology at the master's level.

Graduate programs in the state university system produce research and published results at levels generally acceptable. All faculties are supportive of research activity, and faculty direction of graduate student research effort is very good. The University of Florida offers a particularly rich cross- and multi-disciplinary research environment readily availed by its faculty (see concern below). The research effort by faculty in smaller programs, who generally are busy just to keep programs afloat is commendable (see concern below).

It is appropriate to note in this context, though these comments could as easily be voiced in the undergraduate section, that the consultants are impressed with outreach efforts in virtually all programs--into public and private service agencies, into public schools, and into a host of other consultant-type activities. Viewed another way, the impression is left that anthropologists in the State of Florida are committed to making themselves as useful as possible to relevant others.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants question the adequacy of research facilities in some programs, especially for archaeology and biological anthropology.

(2) Consultants observe that stipends for graduate research and teaching assistants are inadequate.

(3) Consultants are concerned, except for the University of Florida, that multidisciplinary activity is not strong in the State University System.

(4) Consultants note lack of faculty development programs, particularly for renewal, and especially for the few faculty in smaller units who are not as active in research as one would like.

(5) Consultants suggest that graduate programming, at both Ph.D. and M.A. levels, currently is adequate for the State University System.

(6) Consultants believe that graduate student quality in most institutions should be improved through more selective admission policies.

IV. The Faculty

Faculties operating anthropology programs in the State University System generally are graduates of this country's major universities. Well credentialed, they have relatively strong research and publishing records. Despite relatively poor levels of support, and salary levels below national norms, virtually all work hard and complain much less than circumstances warrant. Consultants are of the view that as a whole they represent strong commitment and enthusiasm for the discipline, and bring to their efforts an enthusiasm that is commendable. Consultants also believe that the State of Florida is getting more than its money's worth from the anthropology faculty in its institutions (see concern below). There is much imagination here, and innovation also, especially in the University of Florida and University of South Florida. Of particular note: except for one program, all others in the state system present STRONG RECORDS FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF WOMEN FACULTY.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants note these are make-do faculties, often working under severe handicap to deliver quality programs to students and other constituents.

(2) Consultants are concerned that the program scale in most departments requires levels of activity greater than the staffing pattern allows; that support services are severely over-taxed; and that some faculty, therefore, are seriously over-committed.

(3) Consultants observe that salary levels are inadequate, with recent appointments causing serious salary compressions.

V. Recommendations

A. That the BOARD OF REGENTS strengthen existing programs rather than initiate new ones;

B. That the BOARD OF REGENTS not approve any new graduate programs in the near future. If demand for a new program arises in the 1990's, FSU should be considered as the university most able to implement such a program.

C. That the BOARD OF REGENTS not encourage joint-institution Ph.D. program effort;

D. That the BOARD OF REGENTS clarify teaching/research missions of the regional institutions, and communicate same to faculty;

E. That the BOARD OF REGENTS clarify by institution general education philosophy and substance, and the relationship of same in each to the 1985 update of THE MASTER PLAN;

F. That the BOARD OF REGENTS initiate a systemwide faculty development plan to address specifically the concept of faculty renewal;

G. That the BOARD OF REGENTS explore the creation of institutional networks to stimulate substantive exchange and variety among and between small-faculty units;

H. That the BOARD OF REGENTS pursue aggressively the recruitment and maintenance of faculty as high priorty.

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS IN ANTHOROPLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

The Department of Anthropology at the University of Florida intends to become one of the top ten departments in the country. Since it now ranks securely among the top twenty--perhaps most improved in that lot during the past five years--consultants agree that its objectives are both reasonable and within reach. Having set such a lofty standard, the faculty now are moving with commendable aggressiveness. Consultants agree further that this is a fine program, rooted firmly in traditional anthropology and growing securely into its future. They note, however, that greatness in this department must follow the same path as in any other--excellent faculty, excellent students, and a support system equal to the demands of both. The state can rest assured that anthropology at the University of Florida is addressing international, state, and local needs.

I. The Undergraduate Experience

General Education:

Faculty attitude in this large, professionally-driven, department strongly supports involvement in the university's general studies program. Because of this interest, indeed, this concern, and because of its size and complexity, the department can, therefore, provide students with a variety of general education options in each of anthropology's sub-disciplines. Faculty note particularly the obligation of anthropology to foster international awareness and understanding, with similar value and commitment affirmed in the context of the state's ethnic variety.

The Baccalaureate:

The department offers several options, which it labels "streams", for those who wish to major in anthropology. This convenient clustering of courses directs students to particular interests in the discipline, while at once ensuring that broad, but basic, perspectives in the field become the property of all. Consultants believe this approach to be appropriate, especially since the department projects such a comprehensive image. Faculty currently are reviewing the courses programmed for each stream, indicating continuing concern for, and monitoring of, this segment of the program. Students generally express satisfaction with the substantive content of their courses, and believe they are well prepared for graduate work at the University of Florida or elsewhere. All agree that the anthropology major is helpful in comprehending the world around them, and in assisting them to understand some of its complexities. They are aware, however, of living in a large, complex department, and that the casual mentoring time they desire, therefore, is not possible.

Special Concerns:

(1) Students note their concerns for improved advising (as separate from mentoring), and more stability of course sequencing in their respective streams, especially in archaeology.

(2) Faculty and students report inadequate teaching facilities and lack of appropriate materials, where required, to meet the needs of undergraduate instruction, especially in biological anthropology.

(3) Faculty note that clerical staff are too few to support the level of undergraduate activity generated in the department, and that faculty spend too much time in such housekeeping chores.

(4) Faculty, students, and consultants note woefully inadequate quarters for a department seeking to become "ten."

(5) Faculty are not convinced that teaching returns proper reward.

II. The Graduate Experience

The department offers five graduate programs: general M.A. and Ph.D.; the interdisciplinary M.A. and Ph.D.; and, the Master of Arts in Teaching. The spread from general, i.e., traditional, to interdisciplinary, i.e., applied, is commendable for a department seeking national stature as is this one. Opportunities for specialization are possible in all major sub-fields in anthropology, and within the applied track options range over medical, agricultural, educational, planning, disaster relief, and evaluation/policy areas. There is current interest in building up the biological anthropology side of the program. While there are excellent young people in this sub-field in the department now, the cost of achieving broad-based excellence in this area should be carefully assessed. In addition, the department's graduate programs are integrated into a host of multidisciplinary centers, but notably those focused on Latin America, Africa, agriculture, and medicine. The international thrust of this department is clear and unequivocal, but not at the expense of domestic programming. Faculty expertise covers most major areas of the world, but is particularly strong in Latin America and Africa. The organization and structure of graduate programs are consistent with the prestigious company coveted by the department, and appropriate checks and balances are in place to ensure that end. College policies to encourage multidisciplinary centers, pair leaves, and share indirect cost revenue with principal investigators, departments, and centers, are commended as forward-looking. There is a good administrative enviornment for research.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants question not requiring at least one foreign language of students seeking graduate degrees.

(2) Students complain that curriculum is unsettled by the research demands expected of faculty.

(3) Faculty question whether they exercise adequate control over student progress.

(4) Consultants note that support shortages mentioned in the undergraduate context apply equally to the graduate experience in this department.

(5) Consultants question continuing to advertise the M.A.T. degree in university publications when it no longer is offered.

(6) Faculty question validity of the university's proclaimed interest in international activities.

(7) Consultants note possible understaffing in the applied anthropology medical track because a faculty member in that area has assumed responsibility for directing the university's gerontology effort.

(8) Consultants observe that achieving excellence in a particular area of biological anthropology might be preferable to building a broad-based program.

As noted earlier, program excellence of the kind projected for this department requires an outstanding student body to challenge and be challenged by an outstanding faculty. Students come to this program from other institutions in Florida, and from the national pool of candidates, the best of whom are recruited heavily by the best universities in the country. They are admitted if they meet or exceed threshold entry requirements previously established by the department.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants advise that this system will not deliver the student quality required to make Florida's program nationally competitive.

III. The Faculty

Faculty in this department, junior through senior, are outstanding to excellent; no weak spots and no deadwood. The dean, chairman, and others, who have shared recruiting efforts in recent years, are to be commended. Their success has brought exceptional strength to the faculty, nurtured the department's national visibility, and sustained its image as a program on the move. Recent appointments range from those of established academic to public policy reputation, reflecting departmental efforts to bridge the traditional and applied ends of the anthropological continuum. The research and publication output of the department reflects the quality of its faculty as much as any other indicator. This is not to imply any less interest in teaching; consultants found support for good teaching among all who were interviewed. Faculty are involved in national and international organizations and professional pursuits.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants observe that the quality faculty being recruited to the University of Florida will be satisfied with nothing less than the level of support required to produce good teaching and good scholarship.

(2) Students note, and consultants confirm, the research demands which faculty put on themselves may, on occasion, unsettle the curriculum.

(3) Consultants observe that strength of faculty is causing some concern for level of involvement in departmental decision-making.

(4) Faculty and consultants note that the state's economy, combined with high quality, recent appointments, is creating serious salary compressions.

IV. Recommendations

A. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND COLLEGE examine the level of clerical support provided the Department of Anthropology;

B. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND COLLEGE explore all available options to solve critical space problems for the Department of Anthropology;

C. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND COLLEGE increase graduate student support to enable the recruitment of students up to the quality of the anthropology faculty;

D. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION, COLLEGE, AND DEPARTMENT consider reallocation, or other means, to deal with "worst case" salary compressions;

E. That the COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT ensure adequate resources for instructional materials in biological anthropology and archaeology undergraduate courses;

F. That the COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT eliminate the Master of Arts in Teaching degree advertised for the Department of Anthropology.

G. That the DEPARTMENT reconsider its decision not to require a foreign language for its graduate degrees;

H. That the DEPARTMENT develop a more selective admissions policy to ensure a graduate student population equal to faculty quality;

I. That the DEPARTMENT ensure better quality advising for both undergraduate and graduate students.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

Begun as a formal department in 1967, anthropology in the University of South Florida has been on an unique and fast track ever since. This department has nurtured its future carefully, tailoring programs, staffing patterns, and image to match its place in one of the state's largest, and fastest growing, metropolitan areas. It is a textbook example of how a program can make academic adaptation to a special circumstance without sacrificing traditional virtue. This young, vigorous program exudes an energy and optimism that clearly aligns it with the future; it seeks to make a difference and properly supported will make things happen.

I. The Undergraduate Experience

General Education:

The faculty in this department share serious concern that the message of anthropology should be incorporated into the world view of those who graduate from the University of South Florida. The substantive content of introductory courses, combined with statements of intent by the faculty, make this clear. Interviews with non-majors confirm appreciation of their experience in these courses.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultant urges this university to give bold, innovative attention--in both philosophy and substantive content--to the kind of general education that will prepare its graduates best for the future.

The Baccalaureate:

The undergraduate curriculum is adequate and appropriate to provide students with the general education experience noted above, and/or a baccalaureate degree qualifying them for entry into graduate anthropology programs at USF or elsewhere. There is annual faculty review of those lower division courses considered most relevant to communicating the anthropological perspective. The department believes student quality to be improving, and alumni and currently enrolled students praise their classroom experience. This praise runs not only to substantive knowledge but to adaptive skills in listening, communicating, and synthesizing. Of special note is the high praise accorded faculty for their mentoring commitment to undergraduates. Extensions of this commitment are noted further in a variety of departmentally sponsored activities intended to create a sense of community among students with interest in anthropology's perspective. Chief among these are a club for anthropology majors, a student anthropology fair, creation of a special departmental honors program, and a host of social events during the annual cycle, all intended to bring majors and those otherwise interested into interactive contact. Given the number of faculty lines in this department, and the labor-intensive activity implied in all of the above (see comments also in section II to follow), it is both surprising and commendable that this level of involvement can, and does, occur. Consultant notes that library resources are reasonably satisfactory, but that instructional space is wanting; the faculty states there is a shortage of computing capability for instructional purposes.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultant advises that unless relief is forthcoming, this labor intensive model, although pedagogically exemplary, will cause unusual stress for faculty expected to do research and publish at levels required for the

University of South Florida to gain status as a first rate research institution.

(2) Consultant advises further that the problem just noted will be compounded for young faculty not yet tenured.

(3) Faculty note, and consultant concurs, clerical staff to support the level of activity described is inadequate.

II. The Graduate Experience

The program's thrust--cultural anthropology toward public service and archaeology toward public archaeology--make the department's M.A. and Ph.D. programs fit beautifully within the university's urban mission. Though neither of these options taken alone is unique, constructing a graduate program devoted exclusively to their application, and to non-academic placement, is. Since this innovative move, begun first at the M.A. level in 1974-75, was perceived by many in the anthropology community as high risk, the South Florida gamble gained instant national visibility. The success of the USF "applied M.A." not only sustained this visibility, but continues to have multiplier effect today that is far greater than one might expect. This image is abetted by faculty active in contemporary research over a broad front, many of whom are involved nationally in the discipline. The stage was thus framed nicely for the appearance of the department's Ph.D. in "applied anthropology" in 1984-85.

In implementing these unique programs, the department has pioneered more extensively than any other an internship model in applied anthropology that has as one of its functions marketing the discipline to human service agencies in the Tampa Bay area. Over 250 such agencies have been developed into a potential-users network. The placement record to this point, combined with

favorable testament by alumni and employers, indicates positive response by the client populations. Community outreach by the department is strong also in a myriad of other ways, i.e., faculty are involved heavily in consulting, serving on service agency boards in the community, and in meeting heavy demand from regional public schools for lecturing and related activities.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultant notes same concern in the graduate context as in the baccalaureate, i.e., possible consequences of an innovative program model which, though doing a great job meeting institutional objectives, is so labor intensive as to be dysfunctional.

The fit between program objectives, faculty strength, recruitment of faculty and students, and quality and commitment of the student body, indicate program integration at all levels to be excellent. Curriculum at the M.A. is well tuned, and the Ph.D. is off to a good start. Preliminary concern is raised by graduate students regarding range and frequency of courses possible with such heavy commitments by faculty, and pose a question at this stage as to whether the Ph.D. program might require less of an anthropological perspective than the M.A. which requires a structured core course sequence. Library is adequate for the program level currently effected, instructional space is very tight, and research and laboratory space and support are seriously deficient.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultant notes gratuitous observation of too little cross-disciplinary participation by students and faculty throughout the social and behavioral sciences.

(2) Consultant observes that faculty and students, with morale running high because of participation in a successful innovative effort, are having difficulty reconciling their success against levels of support received.

III. The Faculty

This is an excellent, generally young, faculty that takes teaching, research, professional, and community obligations seriously. Department and college leadership are both to be commended for putting together a group so committed to the department's unique program posture. Special note is made of excellent recent appointments, and of the attention paid to female recruitment. All faculty are well-credentialled and dossiers indicate active research and publishing records for most. Excellent esprit exists in the group, with all working exceptionally hard. Faculty are heavily involved at local, regional, and national levels of professional activity.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultant, faculty, and students all fear that labor-intensive quality of this successful program may negatively influence retention.

(2) Consultant observes that many young faculty in this department will soon be vulnerable to employment offers elsewhere, putting the possibility of an exciting future at risk.

IV. Recommendations

A. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND COLLEGE assess all levels of support against the program developed by the Department of Anthropology;

B. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND COLLEGE implement policies to encourage cross-disciplinary interaction by faculty and students, e.g., adjunct and joint-appointments;

C. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION institute review of the substance and philosophy of the university's general education requirements;

D. That the COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT ensure that service obligations of nontenured faculty not be at the expense of research and timeliness of publication required to compete for such status;

E. That the DEPARTMENT review whether the Ph.D. program requirements are less conducive to the anthropological perspective than that ensured by the core requirements for the M.A;

F. That the DEPARTMENT explore strengthening its non-academic vocational orientation by delineating more specific substantive tracks, e.g., nutrition, gerontology, planning, management, etc.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Anthropology was introduced to the State of Florida in 1924, at Florida State University, when Raymond F. Bellamy, a sociologist, offered elementary courses in the subject. Some 25 years later, under the stewardship of Hale G. Smith, an archaeologist, the Department of Anthropology was formed. Since then the university's reputation for good quality anthropology at the baccalaureate and master's level has spread throughout the South. The evaluation just completed indicates this reputation still to be deserved.

I. The Undergraduate Experience

General Education:

The department contributes to the university's general education program, and does so from commendable intellectual perspective, i.e., to add to one's knowledge base rather than seizing the opportunity to seduce the student into a disciplinary major. The quality of instruction provided to the general education experience is judged to be high.

The Baccalaureate:

The undergraduate curriculum leading to the baccalaureate is in excellent condition. Commended by alumni for its unusual breadth and holistic perspective, and as excellent preparation for those who seek advanced degrees in anthropology, it is praised also for its relevance to non-anthropology careers. Further, the department values its participation in the social science interdisciplinary program. Again, the quality of instruction at this level is considered high to excellent. Library and other instructional support systems are adequate.

Special Concerns:

(1) Faculty register concern regarding quality of the courses transferred by students from some community colleges.

(2) Consultants register concern that this department, whose strength is breadth of field, does not have an anthropological linguist.

II. The Graduate Experience

The department continues with a long-standing master's level program that plays to its strength, archaeology. Consistent with national trends, neither the number of applicants nor admissions to the graduate program are as high as in the early seventies. The current student population, however, is adequate for the number of faculty, especially given the higher than customary teaching loads. It is worthy of note that this program may well place its master's degree graduates better than any other in the country; since entry into the profession typically requires the Ph.D., it presents an unusually good history on this score. Faculty are sensitive to the need to tilt their programs, whenever feasible, to applied concerns. Also of particular note, the department's long-standing affiliation with the National Park Service has been, and continues to be, a special asset. This relationship, when functioning optimally, provides a level of adjunct expertise typically not available to an academic department, and provides excellent field research opportunities for graduate students. Library, instructional, and research support are adequate for a program of its current scale. Consultants commend the administration's efforts to encourage and support faculty research initiative.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants question the department's not requiring competency in one foreign language for the M.S. degree. Absence of this requirement is counter to comparable high quality master's level programs elsewhere.

(2) Consultants alert the department and college to determine the reasons for infrequent scheduling of some graduate courses, noting possible explanations to be faculty research and undergraduate teaching commitments.

(3) Graduate students express concern for more thorough advising; reasons noted in #2 above may also pertain here.

(4) Faculty and National Park Service anthropologists are concerned that the relationship between their two units shows some deterioration.

(5) Faculty note, with concurrence by consultants, that clerical support is shy for the activity generated in this department.

(6) Consultants observe that the department, given expressions of interest in applied matters, should integrate its programs more strongly with others in the university, and be more innovative in capitalizing FSU's location in the state capitol, and serving its special populations.

It is something of a mystery to the consultants that this department did not install a Ph.D. program during the expansionist years of the 1960s. Searching for the reasons for this non-happening are not part of the charge for this evaluation; current faculty interest in the matter, however, is, and there is current interest. The department's request that it be allowed to offer the Ph.D. degree seems to be made at a most inopportune time. Nationally, the supply of new Ph.D.'s in anthropology continues to exceed demand, with change in this condition not expected for at least five years, and even then on a somewhat questionable basis. There is published research, and even

stronger oral tradition, that demand for doctorates in anthropology will begin to exceed supply in 1991. Neither the research nor the oral tradition, however, take into account recent legislation intended to stretch retirement options well beyond, perhaps even do away with, current termination norms. Despite these conditions, the consultants are agreed that consideration of a Ph.D. for this department is an innovation whose time has come. Our concern thus is more for the process by which such consideration occurs than with the outcome, and in this regard we suggest a process that involves three stages: (1) a detailed assessment of departmental mission over the next ten to twenty years; (2) involvement by expertise drawn from the national community of anthropologists; (3) followed by a detailed proposal, again involving expertise as noted in #2 above.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants are concerned with the department's ability to develop a doctoral program that will provide the kind of training that will be in demand in coming years.

III. The Faculty

Faculty take their teaching and research obligations seriously. Research and publications are in contemporary problem areas, and for a department without Ph.D.-level activity extramural funding is reasonably high. Colleagiality is excellent as is morale. The department deserves commendation for recruiting female faculty.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants are concerned that computer literacy is spotty in the faculty.

(2) Consultants observe that retention of highly qualified and productive young faculty may rest on salary, teaching load, and lack of Ph.D. activity.

IV. Recommendations

A. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION support the department's request to recruit an anthropological linguist at first opportunity;

B. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND DEPARTMENT conduct an internal study to determine its future direction and the emphasis that would be given to a Ph.D. program if one is proposed in the future.

C. That the COLLEGE AND THE DEPARTMENT consider requiring competency in one foreign language for the M.S. degree in anthropology;

D. That the COLLEGE AND THE DEPARTMENT seek reduction in the teaching load of productive research faculty to four courses per year (exclusive of independent studies);

E. That the DEPARTMENT move to ensure regular offering of basic graduate courses;

F. That the DEPARTMENT reinforce faculty commitment to graduate advising;

G. That the DEPARTMENT consider ways to re-enforce its relationship to the National Park Service, through devices such as expanded colloquia and workshops on subjects of mutual interest.

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY

The Department of Anthropology at Florida Atlantic University was started in 1964, the year the university was founded. Since then its fortunes have been tied to a great extent to the rhythm and growth of the larger institutions. Particularly germane in this context is recent modification of the original two year upper level mission of the institution to four-year status. This has left the department with some feeling of unrealized expectations.

I. The Undergraduate Experience

General Education:

The faculty does an excellent job teaching basic anthropology. Four in number, they represent cultural anthropology, archaeology, and physical anthropology, not an uncommon spread when the intent is to achieve disciplinary breadth. Sensitive to their university's history, in particular, (1) some eighty percent of the student body from the immediate area, (2) a typically strong student vocational bent, now seeming stronger, influenced no doubt by (3) a developing high tech industrial environment in the immediate area, and (4) the university's accompanying tilt to priority in engineering, science, and business, they feel strongly the need to ensure input into the general education of Florida Atlantic students. Since anthropology is well established in the core curriculum of the university, they are doing this, and doing it well.

The Baccalaureate:

Faculty sentiment is clearly on the side of undergraduate instruction as its major responsibility, and indeed of the view that the baccalaureate

program is its major strength. Certainly they are encouraged in this perspective by students and recent alumni, who uniformly praise the quality of their undergraduate experience. Such praise runs to excellent mentoring, quality teaching, and substantive content. Noted in the latter context especially is expressed appreciation for thinking and research skills, both imparted and sharpened, at the undergraduate level. Library and physical facilities are adequate for the current level of operation, and instructional resources, though quite lean, are passable.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants and faculty note concern that little attention is paid to planning and integrating the role of social sciences in the institution.

(2) Faculty are not sure that their enthusiasm for quality teaching is shared by the administration.

(3) Consultants observe, though it is not yet a significant problem for this department, energy siphoned to the Broward campus may negatively tax units as small as this one.

(4) Students note that the small size of the department, combined with their own part-time employment status, poses scheduling problems.

(5) Consultants are concerned with what appears to be lack of attention to more innovative program possibilities.

II. The Graduate Experience

The department's M.A. degree in anthropology, though opted by small numbers of students over the years, has a record of considerable success and is judged by consultants to be a good program. The option to pursue a Ph.D. in a program jointly structured with the University of Florida, requiring one to spend time on the Gainesville campus to pursue more specialized courses

than are available in Boca Raton, has not been prominently elected frequently. Discussion with students on this matter elicits reservations about a "move" to Gainesville, frequently citing vocational limitations. However, on occasion disturbing sentiments were expressed on rights of access, i.e., the state's obligation to provide advanced graduate work within domiciliary proximity. Of particular note, students appreciate the effort by some faculty to encourage them in research, to present papers at professsional meetings, and to publish in professional journals. Library and physical facilities are adequate for current level of programming; general support is somewhat shy.

Special Concerns:

(1) Students believe a Ph.D. should be offered at the Boca Raton campus, with only vague notions of what such programming entails; their beliefs were abetted somewhat by the administrative strategy to seek a doctoral program in its second five-year plan.

(2) Faculty are not sure that the administration supports research effort to the extent it says.

(3) Consultants are concerned that the Ph.D. might be entertained seriously without adequate attention to questions about resource and other needs.

(4) Faculty note the need for graduate student support and for increased attention to their own professional development needs.

III. The Faculty

Small in number, all four are tenured. Each individual has clearly defined scholarly interests, and all are current in recent developments in those interests. There is, as one might expect, variation among individuals in their levels of scholarly productivity. As noted previously, all are aware and sensitive to teaching obligations, and all are doing well in this area.

Special Concerns:

(1) Faculty express strong concern for salary improvement.

(2) Consultants see need for improved communication between faculty and administration regarding budgetary concerns.

IV. Recommendations

A. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION examine and communicate clearly to the department its objectives for the social sciences;

B. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION, COLLEGE, AND DEPARTMENT not consider implementing a Ph.D. in this department without appropriate consideration of need and adequate resources;

C. That the DEPARTMENT develop innovative program options that are more focused on community and regional issues.

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

Anthropology at the University of Central Florida is part of a department that also houses sociology. Located in a region characterized by rapid and recent growth, the institution's urban mission is accommodated nicely within anthropology's own objectives.

I. The Undergraduate Experience

General Education:

The faculty see teaching at the general education service level as one of its major functions. As a consequence, a wide range of options are provided the general education student, with coverage ensured for each of anthropology's four major sub-fields. All feel that one measure of success in this effort is the degree to which students in other fields can be stimulated to explore anthropology. Since one course in anthropology is included in the university's general education program, some contact with that population is assured. The department is to be commended for a recent decision to try to increase its service enrollments.

The Baccalaureate:

The undergraduate curriculum generally is commendable for its breadth of coverage and for its innovative, contemporary course packaging. Students who take the B.A degree in anthropology are well prepared for graduate work elsewhere, or to enter the job market as liberal arts graduates. Interviews with current students and recent graduates show them to be well prepared and very enthusiastic about their programs of study. All compliment excellent faculty mentoring on program and professional matters, all exhibit a good feel

for the discipline, and all present an unusually strong liberal arts orientation, with an understandable tilt toward the anthropological perspective. Also impressive is the ability of these students to apply the concepts and principles of anthropology to their immediate physical and social environments. The department provides field opportunities for its undergraduates on archaeology projects managed by two of its faculty in Belize, and on projects in the immediate region. Consultants support such efforts as not all that common and as innovative. Recent decisions of the department to seek more majors, and to seek external grants and funds to support the baccalaureate program, are commended. There is student and faculty interest in securing the M.A. degree, though not enough attention has been paid to cost/accounting this innovation, nor to its need. Visual aids and library resources are adequate for current operations scale.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants are concerned that institutional custom or rules seem to discourage cross-listing of courses or the development of interdisciplinary ones; and by extension, the same concern is raised regarding joint-appointment potential for faculty.

(2) Consultants note inadequate facilities for laboratory work in physical anthropology and archaeology.

(3) Faculty express ambivalence as to administration's teaching/research priorities.

(4) Consultants note that practicum opportunities abound in the Orlando region, that the field-type experience available to archaeologists should be encouraged also for students interested in cultural anthropology.

(5) Students note frequency and variety of course offerings, and not enough focus on urban and applied anthropology, as problem areas.

III. The Faculty

The faculty are well trained, highly motivated, and excellent teachers. They all are involved in research and publishing, and have set as one of their objectives an increased level of publication. Two have extensive research projects, under a special funding arrangement, underway in Belize. This research is of high quality and brings visibility in Mayan studies to the institution.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants note stability of small faculty, and given major teaching emphasis are concerned that faculty renewal be given proper attention.

(2) Faculty, administration, and consultants register concern for institutional responsibility should funding for the Belize projects discontinue.

IV. Recommendations

A. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION examine and communicate clearly to the department its objectives for the social sciences;

B. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND COLLEGE examine issues of faculty development for departments such as anthropology, where faculty numbers are small and teaching obligations are heavy.

C. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION, COLLEGE, AND DEPARTMENT not seek to make the University of Central Florida a major center for Mayan studies until full financial and programmatic ramifications of such effort are explored; external expertise to consider this question is a must;

D. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION, COLLEGE, AND DEPARTMENT not implement the M.A degree in anthropology at this time;

E. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND COLLEGE seek a solution to the department's inadequate instructional facilities for physical anthropology and archaeology;

F. That the DEPARTMENT develop local and regional undergraduate practical opportunities for students interested in cultural anthropology;

G. That the DEPARTMENT provide a more explicit curricular focus for urban and applied anthropology.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA

The anthropology program at the University of West Florida, leading to the B.A. degree, was begun in 1981. Housed in a department with sociology and geography, the program is now managed by two professors who occupy one and one-half faculty lines. Functioning mainly as a service to the university, and to the community and region, this program is creating unusual excitement, and is achieving results far exceeding any reasonable expectation. It is a prime example of the effectiveness possible by expending long hours and having active imaginations, but which, because of its small scale, can easily be overlooked on the broader canvas. Evalutaions such as this one are to ensure that such does not occur.

I. The Undergraduate Experience

General Eduation:

In the Fall of 1985 this small department initiated its own self-study, and concluded that it should be teaching a wide range of general anthropology information courses for students in international business, management, education, nursing, environmental planning, political science, communications, and similar "real world" disciplines. The attitude and drive revealed in this action says it all for the commitment by this small faculty to general education, a commitment missionistic in the best sense of that term, and reminiscent of that which the folklore of anthropology tells us characterized the early pioneers of the discipline. This zeal is extended, and not incidentally, into the community and region at large. The archaeologist, for example, has organized a summer program for junior high and high school

students, has developed a volunteer organization of some eighty people, many of whom are retired, to assist with local field projects, and, with her colleague in cultural anthropology, stands in the forefront of movements to create awareness of the local environment. The cultural anthropologist, in turn, reaches out to the community constantly, his most recent effort being an innovative program to educate local businesses on the potential for employing the hearing impaired. Not only is this the stuff of good anthropology, but also of a good regional university, and it is not lost on the local media. The latter give constant coverage to the activities of these people, hence constant coverage to the university, with the prominence of themes of cultural and historical awareness.

Special Concerns:

(1) Faculty, students, and consultants question a general studies program model that does not include anthropology and sociology, especially given the character of the Pensacola community and region.

The Baccalaureate:

There are two major populations served by the curriculum designed for the B.A. degree: (1) a small number of students who go on to do graduate study elsewhere, and (2) those who take substantial course work in anthropology because of a perceived benefit to other majors. To meet both needs, the department has put together a program of strength and breadth, especially so for its size, and delivers it with gusto. Students and alumni from both populations noted above are complimentary of content and style, rating their instruction as excellent. A thematic constant in all coursework is the application of anthropological principles, methods, and theory, to the real world off campus. Students universally commend the mentoring commitment

of faculty. Also worthy of note, despite their missionistic zeal for anthropology, the faculty are not disciplinary imperialists: they want to reach out to other programs in the university, and there is evidence that they encourage their students to do the same. Library and physical facilities are adequate for current program scale. The administration's decision to increase the archaeology line from half to full-time equivalency next year is commendable.

Special Concerns:

(1) Students note concern for more course options in anthropology and for increased frequency of offerings, aware of the strain already on faculty.

(2) Consultants detect sentiments from faculty and students that The University of West Florida, because of its remote location in the state, sits to the side of much that is happening intellectually elsewhere. Efforts should be made to address this situation.

II. The Graduate Experience (NOT APPLICABLE)

III. The Faculty

Much has been said already to note the commitment and fervor of the faculty. Well trained and well educated, they are strongly motivated to help The University of West Florida. They like the region and they want to stay there. It should be noted with some emphasis: even with the strong teaching and service commitments already noted, both faculty are continuing with research and publishing programs. The cultural anthropologist, for example, recently received National Science Foundation support for research; the archaeologist has generated in excess of $900,000 in overhead for the university, primarily through resource management projects funded by national

sources. This activity is large enough that an Office of Cultural and Archaeological Research has been established to facilitate its operations.

IV. Recommendations

A. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION institute a review of the substance and philosophy of the university's general education requirements;

B. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND COLLEGE institute an internal review of the course and program approval process for the general education core;

C. That the COLLEGE facilitate speedy implementation of the revised anthropology course listings.

D. That the COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT implement a colloquiam series to bring anthropologists from other institutions inside and outside the state.

HISTORY IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

Lester Stephens

SUS OVERVIEW

I. Introduction

General Comments:

During the early 1970s, the number of undergraduate students majoring in history declined nationally, while the number of graduate students receiving the Ph.D. in history increased. Simultaneously, student concerns about the great rigour of the general requirements for history in the undergraduate curriculum resulted in a decline in the number of students enrolling for history survey courses, especially in western civilization. After a few years the number of history majors stabilized and is now increasing slightly. By the mid-1980s, many history departments had returned to their emphasis on the value of history, particularly western civilization, but some also began to stress the necessity of world history in general education. The renewed emphasis produced salutary, if not dramatic results, and so the role of history in American colleges and unversities has re-gained some of its prior status as an essential subject in general education, albeit not without many pleas for re-thinking traditional approaches.

After the great glut of Ph.D.s in history during the early 1970s, several institutions reduced the number of students entering doctoral programs in that field. Moreover, the decreasing market for history faculty resulted in some reduction in the number of graduate students entering doctoral programs in that discipline. Unfortunately, some Ph.D. degree-granting departments of history did not respond to the market and thus have continued to turn out sizeable numbers of Ph.D.s in history. Consequently, the supply of new and

recent Ph.D.s in history still exceeds considerably the market demand. Relief of this situation is not likely to occur until the early or mid-1990s. Abolition of mandatory retirement at the age of seventy makes any estimates about the rapidity of improvement of the market problematic, and it therefore seems unrealistic for other than only a very small handful of especially strong, newer departments of history to establish new doctoral programs in history. Problems are compounded by the notable decrease in the number of black students enrolling for Ph.D. study in history and by the predominance of white-male faculty who hold tenure in American departments of history. Although the number of women appointed to the faculties of history departments has increased in recent years, the imbalance is still appreciable.

Encouraging signs of renewed emphasis on the role of history in high-school, college, and university curricula have appeared during the last five years. Reports of national committees call for better recognition of, and more rigor in, the study of the past as a vital component of the curriculum dealing with general education. Some institutions are responding very favorably to the recommendations of the various national committees. Many university departments of history are troubled by the desire to achieve excellence in teaching while producing worthy scholarly publications. Indeed, many institutions have not yet clarified their views: on the one hand, they want to assure quality in their instructional programs, while, on the other, they recognize that scholarly research not only produces sound professional development but also enhances the reputation of their department. Actually, the dilemma is an old one, and it is not confined to the discipline of history. In reality, most universities qualify for the appelation of "university" because they have a three-fold mission: teaching, research, and service. Actually, all three missions can be carried out if faculty loads and

institutional expectations are sufficiently balanced and if faculty are properly rewarded for their attainments in each, especially in the first two. Worthy historical research and publications can be achieved, however, only if teaching loads are reduced, for good research requires time, travel to sources (i.e., archives), and both the moral and financial support essential to sustain it. Contrary to a too-prevalent notion, particularly in smaller, and in many newer, universities, that teaching and research conflict with each other, these functions go hand-in-hand, but only if administrators and governing bodies recognize, support, and reward both.

This dual mission does not mean, of course, that every institution should offer graduate courses in history. Certainly, new Ph.D. programs should be established only when a clear need is evident. Moreover, not every institution should offer an M.A. program in history. As a general rule, while American historians recognize the need for quality in their graduate programs and for rigor in admission of students to those programs, particularly to the Ph.D. program, they do not all accept the view that their own institution should not necessarily offer even an independent M.A. program in history. It seems that some of them tend to look too much toward enhancing the prestige of their department by offering their own independent M.A. program, although they actually make their case by citing the "needs of the community." Financial and library resources necessary for M.A. and Ph.D. programs are enormous. In addition, strong graduate programs require strong faculties noted for their records of scholarly productivity. To offer graduate history programs without these strengths is to promote mediocrity and to drain support from the stronger and well-established graduate programs in a state.

Bearing all of these considerations in mind and endeavoring to apply national standards currently followed in the profession of academic history,

the lead consultant and local consultants for each of the nine departments of history in the State University System of Florida (SUS) attempted to evaluate the strengths and needs of those departments. At the same time they endeavored to evaluate the program(s) of each of those departments in light of state and community concerns. Above all, they tried to weigh the merits of each department on the basis of comparable departments elsewhere in the nation. Since history is taught on every campus in the SUS and since each of the SUS institutions offers at least a baccalaureate degree in history, the role of that discipline is obviously very important. In addition, the study of history is required or encouraged for undergraduate (and occasionally graduate) work in other disciplines. In every institution of the SUS, history plays a role in the general education of undergraduate students, though its perceived importance varies somewhat from institution to institution. Several historians expressed the view that their discipline and their efforts in teaching and scholarly research are under-appreciated, and, in some cases, they seem to be justified in their belief, despite lip-service to the contrary. On the whole, however, the vast majority of higher administrative officials appear to be sincere in stating the importance of the discipline of history, even though some of them, perhaps because of severe financial limitations, do not give the monetary support necessary to convince historians of their commitment to the role of history in their university.

The rapidly burgeoning population of the State of Florida places demands upon the state to accommodate a notably increasing number of students who desire to pursue the study of history. On the one hand, this situation provides a singular opportunity for the state universities to offer courses in history to a significantly large proportion of American citizens, both those of the traditional college age and those of more mature age who want to resume

their studies. On the other hand, the situation is placing a strain upon the presently available resources of nearly all of the history departments in the State University System of Florida, especially upon those in the six newer institutions and particularly upon those located in the fastest-growing areas of the state. At the same time, moreover, it places a strain upon the history departments in the older, research-oriented institutions (the University of Florida and Florida State University), since they must compete with similar institutions throughout the country in attracting the most highly qualified students and in maintaining and enhancing their professional reputation.

Given the current limitation of additional funds from the state to the universities, nearly all of the history departments face problems in maintaining a level of excellence that would set them apart from, or at least make them comparable to, the good history departments in other state universities. To be sure, the likelihood that the departments of history in the nine state universities of Florida will slip below a desirable level is quite remote. But, without additional funds, it is questionable whether all of the history departments in the SUS can meet their full potential in the next few years. Certainly, some reallocation of resources will be beneficial, but only a commitment of more money to those departments will insure the highest level of excellence.

Some departments of history in the SUS bear a special burden of responsibility to offer courses in an increasing number of branches or "centers." This arrangement spreads resources even thinner, exacts too much from the faculty, and hampers the mission of research and scholarly productivity which all of the history faculties accept as part of their professional development. Adding to the strain is the demand, and indeed the necessity, for making libraries available in all of the centers. Even more telling is a

rather widespread notion that every history department should offer an M.A. program and, in several instances, some students demand a Ph.D. program in history. Thus, some of the smaller departments are inclined to disfavor joint programs with the University of Florida because they want their own independent graduate programs in history.

Moreover, a prevailing mentality among many students interviewed is that they can not travel or move elsewhere for advanced work, and many of them insist that the programs should be brought to their locality. This is neither wise nor desirable in every instance. Only a selected few history departments should offer Ph.D. programs in history, and not every department should offer an independent M.A. program. Certainly, the strength of the history faculty at the University of Florida and Florida State University makes it possible for them to offer excellent doctoral programs in history, and their libraries are equally sufficient to the task.

Only one other department of history in the SUS seems to be nearly strong enough to launch a doctoral program in history, and that is the University of South Florida. Its library is not as adequate as it should be for that purpose, but, if another doctoral program in history is desirable, then, with additional resources, USF seems to be the most likely candidate. A question remains, however, whether any other department of history in Florida should offer a Ph.D. degree. The market is still flooded with unemployed history Ph.D.s; only a limited number of outstanding candidates are available; and it would make better sense to strengthen the existing two Ph.D. history programs in the SUS. Above all, state leaders must help to change the prevailing mentality that most universities should offer a Ph.D. in history. The doctoral program must be rigorous, it must be guided by an outstanding research faculty, and it must have an adequate research library. It does not

seem wise, then, to establish Ph.D. programs in history in other institutions, at least for another decade, with the possible exception of the University of South Florida.

At the level of baccalaureate work, however, it can be said that none of the history departments is failing to do its job well. Naturally, some are stronger than others, but on the whole the state can take great pride in the quality of teaching in the undergraduate history programs. Certainly, the tendency to spread resources too thin by opening so many centers could in the long run adversely affect faculty morale and hamper the quality of instruction. Indeed, this ought to be a matter of concern to the Board of Regents and to the State Legislature, especially in light of current limitations on financial resources. Also prevailing in this sense is the popular attitude that nearly every community ought to have a center brought to its doorstep. Of course, the danger of responding to this expectation is that already limited resources will be spread even thinner. What state leaders need to contemplate is the quality of programs; it will be far better to have fewer centers that offer truly excellent programs.

Likewise, excessive reliance upon adjuncts is highly undesirable and rarely adds to the quality of programs. Unfortunately, the history departments in the state universities also face a problem in receiving many transfer students from community colleges that they perceive to be inadequately prepared. But, at present, most of the nine departments of history in the SUS are doing a very good job in their undergraduate programs. A host of dedicated historians assure that excellence in teaching will maintain the strength of the instructional programs in the nine departments of history.

II. Recommendations:

A. Each institution, but especially the newer ones, should clarify and articulate fully its expectations regarding the role of history in its programs, particularly in the general education of undergraduate students. In many cases, it will be beneficial for a history department to draft a statement of rationale for history as part of general education for undergraduate students. This statement should serve as a working document that will be discussed in open meetings with administrators and colleagues from other departments. A spirit of give-and-take is essential, and so too is a spirit of understanding by historians of the role of related disciplines (in the humanities and in the social sciences), which are important components of the undergraduate curriculum.

B. Each institution, especially the newer ones, should clarify and articulate fully its expectations regarding the role of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service in the faculty's overall load, so that the faculty know clearly what they should be doing. Concomitantly, the administration of each institution and the general governing body of the SUS must increase, or at least reallocate, resources, offer proper financial support, and promote and grant tenure on the basis of rigorous fulfillment of the stated mission of that institution.

C. Concurrently, each institution and the governing body of the SUS must clarify expectations concerning regional and national emphasis of each institution. While regional emphasis has an important place in the role of individual institutions, it should not be allowed to detract from significant national considerations. A too-heavy

emphasis on the regionally-based topics and character of a university thwarts the aspirations of good professional historians who recognize that scholarly productivity in their areas of training and interest is a desideratum, irrespective of the topic. Regionally-based research concerns do have a place in historical study, but they must neither be so limited or provincial that the department is viewed by colleagues in other states as solely, or even primarily, narrowly regional in interest.

D. The number of branches or centers should not be expanded, and, in fact, should be reduced unless additional faculty are added. Certainly, a service to various communities is performed by operating units away from the main campus, but these tend to drain the energy of the history faculty and cut into their effectiveness in meeting expectations in other realms of responsibility, especially in scholarly productivity. Of course, a reduction in total load for the regular faculty who teach off the main campus or the appointment of faculty assigned solely or mainly to a branch will help. The use of adjuncts for staffing the branches is not advisable. Of course, some students will have to pay a price for the loss of centers in their community, but it is not a price too high to pay in the interest of quality.

E. The use of so many "adjuncts" is not desirable, and this practice ought to be drastically reduced, or ended altogether. Only regular faculty can assure the uniformity of standards necessary to the operation of high-quality departments of history. Low pay for adjuncts is a guarantee that mediocrity and lack of proper fulfillment of the mission of an institution will prevail far too often.

F. Library holdings for some departments of history must be increased. Several institutions suffer from the present formula, making it difficult for faculty to assign the kind of work needed by history majors and M.A. students. It would be a mistake, however, to cut the library budgets of the major universities that are striving for national reputation, and surely it would be a mistake to establish libraries in all of the branches or centers, which will only place a strain on the main library of the campus and force duplication of holdings.

G. With the possible exception of one department of history, no new Ph.D. program in history should be introduced in the near future. Despite pleas by patrons of some of the newer universities to bring a doctoral program to their doorstep, none of the newer universities, except the University of South Florida, is or will be prepared within the next decade or longer, to offer a Ph.D. program in history. Lack of adequate library holdings and the limited number of faculty noted for scholarly productivity (except in two of the newer institutions) make it impractical to establish any more doctoral programs in history. Moreover, the market for Ph.D.s in history continues, and will likely continue for several more years, to exceed by far the demand. In addition, to establish new Ph.D. programs in history is almost certain to guarantee a reduction in the support of the history departments at Florida State University and the University of Florida, both of which are striving notably to upgrade their own national reputation.

H. Better salaries in general, rectification of some salary inequities, and the appointment of more young historians are needed in order to

stimulate intellectual and pedagogical development to the fullest extent. Of course, nearly all American universities constantly struggle to recruit and retain distinguished faculty in history, and those in Florida are no exception. Under the pressure of continually increasing enrollments and limited financial resources, the SUS departments of history are hard pressed, except in the cases of those which have obtained attractive special professorships, such as the endowed chairs, to recruit the most outstanding faculty. Salaries are not as competitive as they must be if the best faculty are to be hired, and considerable inequities among present SUS faculty salaries either adversely affect morale, or will do so at some point. Certainly, some truly able young faculty have been hired by several SUS departments of history during the last few years, but because too many faculty remain in place after the normal retirement age and because too many comparatively unproductive faculty hold tenured posts, the amount of turn-over has been much too small in some departments. These situations result in the loss of some of that youthful zeal, initiative, and invigoration that makes a department a thriving intellectual enterprise.

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS IN HISTORY

UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA

Role of the Program:

The history department is primarily oriented toward undergraduate programs, but it does have a small, active M.A. program. Also offering service courses, the department plays a central role in the liberal education of students in the UWF. The importance of the department is generally well-recognized by the central administration, and it enjoys the support of the Dean and the Vice President. Despite heavy teaching loads, several of the faculty are productive in research; indeed, some of them possess very commendable records. Thus, in teaching, the department represents great strength in the university, and in research it is generally fulfilling expectations.

Quality of the Program:

The strong commitment of the history faculty to excellence in teaching is especially noteworthy. Some problems do exist, but they emanate primarily from the small size of the faculty, which has shrunk appreciably in recent years. It is impossible for the faculty to offer the variety of courses needed in any good B.A. program, let alone an M.A. program. That the faculty endeavors to cover as many fields as possible is a testament to its dedication. The chairman and faculty have designed an excellent program of studies for undergraduate history majors, and, given the small size of the faculty, the students generally receive a sound education in history. Student morale appears to be quite good. In particular, students praise the world history program. The quality of graduate students is in general remarkably good, but

M.A. students are hard-pressed to get all of the courses they need, and, naturally, the small faculty is strained to offer what it can.

Regional studies play a large role in the department's research program. In fact, they have brought the department considerable notice. Alone, however, they cannot make the department as strong as it could be unless they have a relationship to larger themes of study. Part of the problem lies in the lack of clarity about the research mission of the history department, and, for that matter, the institution as well. The department should decide whether it is located in a primarily regionally-oriented institution or a broadly based institution.

Effective leadership by the chairman over the years is notable, but the department faces a great need for expansion of its faculty by two positions. As with many other departments, this one has to depend too much on adjuncts. Hampered by declining enrollments, however, the institutions has to find ways to reallocate resources, and the history department must be considered as one of those in great need of additional positions.

Major Recommendations:

A. Establish at least two new positions in the Department of History, and reduce dependence upon adjuncts.

B. Clarify the principal missions of the Department of History concerning the role of faculty in teaching, service, and scholarly productivity; establish criteria for carrying the respective missions forward; and grant tenure, promotion, and rewards accordingly.

C. Clarify the role of the Department of History in producing research courses oriented toward the history of their regions, with a view toward emphasizing more studies of a larger scope.

Role of the Program:

History plays a central role in the undergraduate programs, and the department seems to enjoy the support of the central administration. The administrative support does not seem to be fully appreciated, however, for mutual communication between the department and the administration needs to be enhanced. Undoubtedly, the history faculty on the whole is doing an excellent job in teaching undergraduates, but they need to modify their perceptions of the place of the social sciences in the undergraduate curriculum. Both play a vital role, and the faculties in history and the social sciences need to understand better the role of their disciplines in the general education of undergraduates.

Quality of the Program:

The history faculty's commitment to excellence in teaching is a decided strength. Course requirements are generally rigorous, and most of the history faculty require considerable reading and writing. Yet, students praise the faculty, and they seem to appreciate genuinely the quality of instruction. This is all the more noteworthy in light of the rather heavy teaching loads borne by the faculty. It is not so much the number of courses they teach but more the diversity of preparations that makes their loads quite demanding. Such loads make it difficult for the faculty to produce scholarly publications, which they view as an expectation of the administration and as a way of professional development. Some of the faculty do find time to publish, but they are not duly rewarded with release time. The department does need to clarify what constitutes productive scholarship, in terms of quality and not merely of quantity.

The western civilization course is an important part of the undergraduate program, and it is taught quite well. However, the history faculty needs to re-think the course and develop a sound statement of rationale for it as a general education course. This could help to develop mutual appreciation between the history faculty and the social sciences faculty.

An inadequate library and a small faculty make it somewhat difficult for the department to offer an independent M.A. program. The faculty desires to terminate the joint M.A. program with the University of Florida, but it can not adequately cover more fields unless it has two more faculty positions. While it is inconvenient for M.A. students to travel to Gainesville to complete a number of their courses, it is also important to realize that an independent M.A. program must be undergirded by rigor of expectations and strengthened by faculty who have enough time to give to it. These essential requirements are within possibility, but they have yet to be attained. Because of the location of the University of North Florida, a case can be made that it should have an autonomous M.A. degree in history, but, to avoid a mediocre program, certain changes, as mentioned above, are needed. In addition, the administration and the history faculty must clarify expectations regarding the place of teaching and of research in the mission of the institution. Likewise, the history faculty must establish criteria for judging the quality of research.

Major Recommendations:

A. Enhance understanding among the history faculty and other departments and the academic administration.

B. Review the survey courses in western civilization and develop a statement of rationale for teaching them.

C. Add at least one, and desirably, two, faculty positions to the Department of History in order to provide a greater variety of offerings and to reduce the range of courses covered by present faculty.

D. Reduce teaching loads of the history faculty, especially the number of preparations required.

E. Clarify expectations for scholarly productivity, and grant tenure, promotion, and rewards according to explicit criteria.

F. Review the prospects for an independent M.A. program in history in light of the scholarly productivity of the faculty, the number of faculty positions, and library resources, and consider continuation of a joint M.A. program with the University of Florida until such time as these can be set fully in order.

Role of the Program:

Led by a president who is himself a reputable historian, the UCF administration has an excellent grasp of the place of history in the undergraduate curriculum. The department chairman and his faculty show a strong commitment to quality in the instructional program. Despite rather heavy teaching loads, the faculty stresses the importance of writing, and they give essay examinations. Thus, the faculty and the administration view history as central to a good general education; however, it would probably be beneficial to the Department if the administration made more explicit expressions of the role of history and the other humanities in general education.

Quality of the Program:

It is evident that the history department offers a fine program of instruction. The M.A. program is quite good but should be made more rigorous. Moreover, the undergraduate program for history majors probably should include a course in historiography or a senior seminar. Greater distinction needs to be made concerning expectations of graduate students in split-level courses. As with other newer institutions in the SUS, the UCF does not have truly adequate library resources.

Several of the history faculty have rather impressive records of scholarly publications. But some emphasis needs to be given to broader topics of research; rather narrow or solely regional research topics tend to predominate. It is highly commendable, however, that the history faculty appreciates the importance of research and scholarly publication and that the department chairman himself sets a good example. Inadequate funding for research and heavy teaching loads work against the complete fulfillment of the

mission of research, but, admirably, the history faculty and the administration have a good understanding of the mission of the department in scholarly development. Expectations for gaining tenure and promotion are not quite so clear, however.

While the department certainly needs someone to teach African or Far Eastern history, or preferably both, it should continue to emphasize the importance of strengthening the areas already in its program. It should also play a much larger role in the preparation of history teachers, which the faculty seems quite eager to do. Unfortunately, the history department must rely too heavily upon adjuncts, and the size of its secretarial staff is quite inadequate. Despite these deficiencies, the history department is doing a noteworthy job of educating students.

Major Recommendations:

A. Develop an explicit statement regarding the role of history in the general education of undergraduates.

B. Establish more rigorous standards for the M.A. degree in history and develop greater distinction between the work of graduate and undergraduate students enrolled in split-level history courses.

C. Require a senior seminar or a course in historiography for all history majors.

D. Place greater emphasis upon topics of broader scope than is typically pursued by the history faculty in their research and publishing endeavors.

E. Refine and clarify criteria for tenure, promotion, and rewards for scholarly productivity.

F. Reduce the number of adjuncts and establish at least one more faculty position in the Department of History.

Role of the Program:

History enjoys a reasonably sound place in the undergraduate curriculum and is viewed by the administration as important to the liberal education of students. It does not seem to be stressed strongly enough as a desirable major and appears to play more of a secondary role than the applied subjects. At least the history faculty has that impression. Nevertheless, the history department can claim a conscientious and dedicated corps of teachers who appear to work harmoniously among themselves and with other colleagues and the administration.

Quality of the Program:

Certain areas of the history curriculum are not covered, e.g., the "middle" period of U.S. history and southern history. This is especially telling in relation to the strength of the graduate program. Yet, the history faculty fulfills its mission of teaching very well. Undergraduate students seem to be well-qualified in general, and the quality of graduate students appears to be improving. Moreover, the average teaching load is not excessive.

Some of the faculty are very productive in publishing good scholarly works, and occasionally some means are found whereby teaching loads can be further reduced. But the likelihood of increasing numbers of students, a need for more graduate students, and the necessity for staffing a branch or center--all may hamper the level of scholarly productivity by the faculty. Comparatively low salaries make it necessary for many of the faculty to teach every summer. This greatly deters scholarly productivity. Yet, both the

history faculty and the administration view research as part of the mission of the University.

Lack of stipends for graduate students, an inadequate range of courses, and a deficient library make it difficult to offer the best kind of M.A. program, and they indicate that FAU will not be ready to launch a Ph.D. program, as projected, in a few years. Indeed, it seems quite inadvisable even to entertain the establishment of a Ph.D. program in less than a decade. The department and the university appear to have a long way to go before they develop such a program, and it is more realistic for the moment to think in terms of first strengthening the undergraduate program and especially the M.A. program in history.

Support for professional travel is not consistent; the secretarial staff is too small; and many teaching materials (especially maps) are outmoded or badly worn. In addition, the faculty is somewhat burdened by the load of "over-60" auditors who sit in their courses. Moreover, the department is being compelled more and more to rely upon adjuncts. Still, the faculty is doing its instructional job commendably well. It will be helpful for the central administration to develop a more clearly articulated rationale for the place of history in the university; to re-examine its role as a regional and mainly technical institution; and to develop a clearer policy regarding the place of research in the scheme of things for history and the other traditional humanities and social sciences.

Major Recommendations:

A. Add one faculty position to the Department of History in order to provide coverage of essential fields, and in light of likely enrollment increases soon, be prepared to add another position.

B. Enhance understanding and communication between the Department of History and the central administration, especially regarding the role of history in general education and its relationship to the social sciences, and its importance to students preparing for tech ical degrees.

C. Improve salaries and professional support of a notably productive faculty and reduce dependence upon teaching during summers and in branch units.

D. Allocate more resources for library holdings in history.

E. Reduce dependence upon adjuncts.

F. Allocate funds for stipends for outstanding M.A.students.

G. Alter plan to establish a Ph.D. in history in the near future.

Role of the Program:

Serving a very large cosmopolitan area of the state, the FIU Department of History has a unique opportunity to play a central role in the liberal education of numerous undergraduates. While the administration views the department as mainly "supportive" of its other programs, it nevertheless places high value on the survey of western civilization, subscribing to the important view that the roots and thoughts of our culture are crucial to general education. In the planned scheme of things for FIU, the history department will not soon plan to offer a Ph.D. degree, but will likely be able to offer an excellent M.A. program. Emphasis on quality is apparent.

Quality of the Program:

Bolstered by a young, dedicated, and productive faculty, the history department stands out as a very strong unit of the university. The faculty have published, and continue to publish in excellent journals and with noted academic presses. Indeed, this faculty has a number of unusually competent researchers. But they are also dedicated to excellence in instruction. Rigorous and demanding, they offer a splendid challenge to their students, who freely admit that they have to work hard but praise the faculty for the quality of instruction. The number of history majors is increasing, and the quality of student ability appears to be very good on the whole. Because the faculty is relatively small, only a limited number of courses can be offered. But the courses offered are notably strong, and, given the improbability of greatly increasing the size of the faculty in the near future, it will be best for the department to continue to strengthen its present offerings. Faculty morale is high, and self-imposed standards for excellence in teaching and

scholarly productivity set this faculty apart as an especially good one. Unfortunately, the faculty seems to feel that they are underrated, which may be true in part. They seem to feel also that in the eyes of the administration their subject is secondary to the social sciences. This may have an element of truth in it too, but the history faculty does appear to need a more positive attitude toward the social sciences and to develop a strong sense of cooperation and an interest in developing interdisciplinary programs.

At the same time, the administration will likely find it beneficial to recognize the talent associated with the history department and to reward its productive scholars with more travel and research funds, personal computers, and releases from teaching that promise, through the publications of the faculty, to enhance and enrich the reputation of the department and the university. The history faculty should reciprocate by seeking more external grants and to accept that professional and applied studies will likely continue to receive emphasis. Given the competency and performance of the history faculty, the department should offer a challenging M.A. program, which is needed in this large community. First, however, the administration will have to increase the number of positions in the Department so that the range of offerings can be increased. The Department also ought to play a greater role in the preparation of history teachers. With mutual efforts to enhance the status of history in the FIU curriculum, greater recognition of the strength of the history faculty, a more explicit commitment to the place of history in the institution, and an increase in library holdings, the history department can better fulfill its exceptional potential.

Major Recommendations:

A. Improve understanding between the history faculty and the central administration of the role of history and the social sciences in the education of undergraduates.

B. Develop fuller administrative appreciation of the talents and achievements of the faculty of the history department and reward accordingly with more travel and research funds and more release time.

C. Increase the number of faculty positions in the history department by one within the next two years and add a second position within the next three or four years, in order to enhance the variety of course offerings and to provide more release time for the history faculty.

D. Allocate more funds for history holdings in the library, especially for primary sources (such as microfilm copies of the papers of some major American figures and newspapers, particularly of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries).

Role of the Program:

Although history is not a required course, the Department of History finds itself in the happy position of enrolling large numbers of students in its survey courses. Fortunately, the central administration recognizes the importance of history in general education, and it also recognizes that the history faculty is very strong. Unfortunately, it feels it has not been able to allot new positions to the department, and, in fact, the size of the faculty has shrunk because some budget lines have followed history faculty who have taken administrative posts. Yet, the department carries forward exceptionally well in both its mission of teaching and its mission of research.

Quality of the Program:

On the whole, the USF history faculty is extraordinarily strong. Its record of good scholarly publications is very impressive. Indeed, this history department is the only one in the newer institutions that is presently suited to consider the possibility of offering a Ph.D. program in history. Currently, however, its M.A. program is small; it has few stipends, and they are not especially competitive; and its library holdings are not entirely sufficient. In addition, it can not offer the wide range of courses needed for a Ph.D. program. In fact, it needs at least two positions (probably in Afro-American history and some area of Third World history) to round out its offerings for undergraduate and M.A. programs. The department does not need to expand into a large number of other areas, for it can do very well by enhancing the fields it already covers. With some assistance and reallocations to the Department of History, the department can offer one of the two best graduate programs in the state, excluding the University of Florida and Florida State University.

Certainly, the Department of History is carrying a heavy load of responsibility in the USF instructional program, and it is fulfilling its instructional mission notably well. The faculty are on the whole very dedicated teachers, and they appear to be committed to excellence in their endeavors. Unfortunately, the department has to depend too heavily upon adjuncts, and it has to spread itself too thin by offering courses off the main campus.

The history faculty has done a highly commendable job of setting its own standards for promotion, and it has done an excellent job of "nurturing" new faculty. It has also set fairly good standards for admission to its M.A. program, but it finds that more and more students are opting for a non-thesis plan for the M.A., which, as the faculty recognizes, is not a sign of strength for the M.A. program, especially in an institution that claims a strong research orientation. The department does, however, seek to be rigorous in its comprehensive examinations for M.A. students and in the performance expected of graduate students enrolled in split-level courses.

To the department's great credit, it has launched a successful scholarly journal dealing with the history of the region. Along with the other strengths of the department, this publication indicates the healthy research orientation of the department. Given more financial support and resources for history holdings in the library, this department could, if it is decided another Ph.D. history program is needed, do the job better than any other department in the newer universities. More attention to the success of the department, both in its teaching and its research efforts, can only strengthen a very promising department.

Major Recommendations:

A. Add two faculty positions very soon to the Department of History so that the department can offer more undergraduate and graduate third-world history courses and so that the faculty can have a lighter teaching load.

B. Increase allocations for history holdings in the library.

C. Increase the number and amount of stipends for M.A. students and consider fully the use of promising advanced M.A. students as teaching assistants.

D. Consider making a thesis mandatory for M.A. students.

E. Reduce the number of adjuncts.

Role of the Program:

Both the central administration and the history faculty view history as basic to a sound general education, and so history, especially the survey in western civilization, plays a central role in the undergraduate curriculum. Primarily oriented toward the education of undergraduates, the history department focuses upon good teaching and not upon graduate training and research. Some of the history faculty do publish, however, and several of them are involved in the Masters in Applied Social Science (MAPSS) degree program, which is essentially aimed at developing applied courses in the social sciences, with an opportunity for some work in history.

Quality of the Program:

A dedicated corps of history instructors and an exceptionally effective and enthusiastic department chairman assure a commitment to excellence in instruction. Likewise, a strong group of articulate and able history majors adds to the strength of this department. The potential for making this an even stronger department exists, and ways ought to be found to facilitate the fulfillment of that potential.

Certain modifications will have to be made, however, before the department can fully realize its potential. First, the overburdened faculty must find relief. Talented historians have been pulled into administrative positions, and they carry an excessive load of responsibility. At present the department cannot offer nearly enough advanced courses, thus limiting the breadth of preparation of students. Indeed, this department needs three additional positions in order to carry out its instructional mission effectively. A decided weakness of the B.A. degree program is the paucity of

offerings in foreign language. Moreover, far too many students opt for the B.S. degree in history, which is really an anomaly since history is a vital part of a liberal education. In addition, the faculty is saddled with responsibility for administering "the Gordon Rule" in classes of forty-five students. That rule can not be effectively carried out under such circumstances, nor can the department provide the rigor of writing and reading needed for a strong major in history in classes of that size.

Graduate work in history is limited to the MAPSS program, which is neither designed primarily for applied historical studies nor to prepare graduate students to pursue Ph.D. studies if they wish to go on with advanced work in history. The department can offer no substantial work in such an important field as women's studies, and it cannot, under present circumstances, promote fully the kind of faculty development needed to assure highest faculty morale and professional advancement. While some of the history faculty do publish, they do so without special incentive and without a clear sense of the vital role of research in a university. To the great credit of those faculty and to the great credit of dedicated and enthusiastic students, the department does unusually well in light of limitations.

It will be beneficial to the department and to the university administration to re-think the general education requirements for undergraduate students and the centrality of history in those requirements. Toward that end, the history faculty ought to consider the benefits of a two-part world history survey, and they ought to consider seriously the replacement of the present-one-semester survey course in U.S. history. Such a course is now generally outmoded and inadequate to the general education of students in American history. So too must the administration consider the reallocation of resources in order to strengthen the history department. In connection with

this consideration, the administration needs to find ways to reinvigorate the history department with more young scholars and to encourage the retirement of those who have served the institution so faithfully and so long.

Of the nine departments of history in the SUS, none appears to work under greater handicaps than this one. Yet, none can do more than the FAMU history department to serve a particular constituency so well. The department needs more positions, a broader range of offerings, and rewards for scholarly productivity. At its command is an unusually rich repository of primary sources in black history but a generally inadequate store of secondary sources in the library. Certainly, no strong case can be made for offering a general Ph.D. program in the social sciences. No market seems to exist for people thus trained, and definitely not for academic positions in history. A joint M.A. program in history with FSU may be a decided possibility. FAMU's history department has both students and faculty able to engage in such a program.

Major Recommendations:

A. Greatly reduce the administrative responsibilities of selected highly able history faculty or appreciably lighten their teaching loads.

B. Increase the number of faculty positions in the history department by at least three, in order to broaden the scope of offerings, stengthen the programs, and lessen the load of several history faculty.

C. Reduce class size, especially in courses bearing responsibility for the Gordon Rule.

D. Develop a clear statement of rationale for general education requirements in history, especially in world-history surveys, and

consider replacement of the outmoded one-semester survey in U.S. with a two-part survey.

E. Make the degree in history solely a Bachelor of Arts and require the study of a foreign language through the second year for all history majors.

F. Emphasize scholarly productivity more and reward attainments accordingly.

G. Seek to build a department with more young scholars.

H. Considerably increase history holdings in the library or explore a better plan of pooling resources and library usage with the FSU library.

I. Since no market exists for recipients of a Ph.D. in the general social sciences and since such a degree runs counter to specialization in a discipline, tentative plans for a degree of that kind should be abandoned.

Role of the Program:

Supported by the central administration, the history department views history as an essential element in the core curriculum. All graduate students are thus exposed to some formal study of history. The history faculty as a whole possesses a strong commitment to excellence in teaching the survey courses in history, and many of them require considerable reading and writing of the students in those courses. In general the faculty take "the Gordon Rule" quite seriously, but heavy teaching loads for some make it necessary to rely upon "adjuncts" for evaluating essays. Adjuncts appear to take their responsibility seriously, but the sheer number of papers makes the task burdensome. History majors and graduate students find challenging programs in the FSU history department, and, while they voice a few complaints, they are generally satisfied with their programs. Without doubt, history faculty basically fulfill their instructional mission exceptionally well. Also, in general, they view scholarly productivity as a vital part of their professional development.

Quality of the Program:

The quality of instruction in the history department is very high on the whole, but the department is unable to offer as wide a range of courses as it should as a major research and teaching department. It needs productive specialists in women's history, Japanese history, and Russian history. It also needs a healthy infusion of younger scholars. The tenure of a large number of older faculty and the retrenchment of positions have made it impossible for the department to appoint a desirable number of younger scholars.

The market for outstanding young scholars is still abundant and promises to be so for several more years.

The records of scholarly publications by many of the FSU history faculty are very impressive, and certainly some of them measure up to the best in comparable institutions. These include publications on important topics in leading journals or with noted academic presses. Yet, room for improvement exists, and such improvement is likely to occur whenever the department sets higher expectations for itself, wins deserved recognition from the administration for the quality of its work, and receives a boost to its morale from increased salaries, at least for a large number of faculty whose salaries are simply not competitive. It is a point worth special notice, for example, that some productive younger scholars (say, with ten years of experience and a notable record of publications) are receiving even less than the present salary for new, beginning faculty in sister institutions in the Southeast. The faculty have to depend entirely too much upon supplementing their income by teaching in an off-campus center or in summer school, and this is not conducive to scholarly productivity. More travel and research funds are also needed. This history faculty possesses the potential to rise dramatically in professional standing, but it needs greater incentives, rewards, and recognition.

A strong corps of dedicated and able graduate students is an asset of the department. Yet, the department needs to attract more students of outstanding ability. Graduate stipends are too low to be truly competitive and conducive to attracting students from outside the region. It also seems that greater rigor ought to be applied in setting requirements for grading the work of graduate students and in evaluating their readiness for candidacy. At the same time, the faculty needs to be more attentive to the offering of certain

graduate courses instead of concentrating upon leaves of absence in routine fashion. The graduate program would also be enhanced by an "extracurricular" general colloquium or seminar and by having more visiting scholars and guest lecturers on campus. In addition, the demands of a first-rate graduate program requires greater allocations for library holdings. Also, the department needs to consider the broadening of its doctoral fields. Still, the department does a very good job overall in training graduate students. It simply has the potential for even better work.

The one-semester survey of U.S. history is pretty much a relic now and ought to be made into a two-part course. Even if students take only one part of the course, they have gotten some depth in their study of the American past. Moreover, graduate teaching assistants will receive better training by teaching one or both parts of the course. Actually, the pattern in most universities appears to be a two-part survey of U.S. history. In addition, the history faculty should push hard to require a foreign language of all undergraduate students.

The history department plays a strong supporting role in the university, and perceptions of its crucial place need to be improved. The department can claim some truly excellent historians and a very sound commitment to excellence. Departmental leadership has been commendably effective in recent years, and it promises to promote quality in the years ahead.

Major Recommendations:

A. Add three faculty positions to the history department, in women's, Japanese, and Russian history, in order to enhance the programs of a major research and graduate degree-offering department and in order to help reduce faculty teaching loads.

B. Increase the number of younger scholars in the history department through new appointments in the fields noted.

C. After a careful review and comparison with similar departments, rectify salary inequities and establish higher beginning salaries.

D. Discourage teaching by regular history faculty in off campus centers and limit teaching by regular faculty in the summer-school program, in order to enhance the mission of scholarly productivity.

E. Review and rigorously evaluate records of scholarly productivity in light of those in comparable departments of history, using not only quantity but also the quality of presses and journals and the scope of topics of published works as measures of attainment.

F. Enhance administrative appreciation and support of the Department of History.

G. Seek more graduate students of outstanding ability, especially from outside the region; increase stipends for graduate students; develop more rigorous expectations for graduate work and theses and dissertations; establish an "extracurricular" general colloquium; and broaden doctoral fields.

H. Consider strongly the replacement of the one-semester U.S. survey with a two-part survey, using as many advanced doctoral students to teach them as possible.

I. Consider ways to rectify the problem that graduate students have in enrolling for certain courses they need.

J. Require a foreign language for all undergraduate students.

Role of the Program:

Supported strongly by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Department of History plays a significant role in the university's undergraduate curriculum. History survey courses consitute an essential part of the core curriculum, while history graduate programs train a sizeable number of students who become researchers and teachers in other academic institutions in the state and in other parts of the Southeast. The department likewise contributes to the historical profession, through the publications and service of its faculty. Standards of excellence generally prevail in this department.

Quality of the Program:

Led by a dedicated, able, and imaginative chairman and solidified by a harmonious and dedicated faculty, the history department has made excellent progress in recent years. It has made a number of very wise decisions in the appointment of junior faculty and in the recruitment of distinguished professors. Along with a number of projects launched by the chairman, these appointments offer the great promise that this department will indeed rise to national recognition in the profession.

The history faculty possesses an excellent and realistic sense of where it stands at present and of where it hopes to go. In fact, the department is already nationally recognized in some areas (e.g., Latin American history), and it is highly respected even in those areas that need to be strengthened. Now the department is able to attract some outstanding graduate students from other parts of the nation.

Concern for excellence in teaching in both graduate and undergraduate courses is obvious. The coordinators of instruction in both programs appear

to be admirably dedicated to the development of quality in survey, upper-division, and graduate courses, and they are attempting to address certain needs. The coordinators, the chairman, and the faculty in general realize that the history survey courses are already good but deserve some special attention (e.g., in uniformity of expectations among the instructors of those courses). Likewise, the faculty recognizes the need for some improvements in the program for majors (e.g., pro-seminars in historical methods and historiography, and more writing assignments). The graduate faculty also acknowledges the need for improvements (e.g., more specific reading seminars for graduate students and the elevation of admission standards).

While the department has been very successful in securing funds for highly competitive fellowships, it is handicapped by inadequate funding for most regular assistantships. It also needs to recruit more minority students and improve its orientation and formal training of teaching assistants. In addition, the department needs to appoint a senior Europeanist, and recruit more students in European history.

The number of faculty on leaves of absence attests to the professional standing and ability of this faculty, but simultaneously it occasionally places a strain upon the schedule of offerings for graduate students because they sometimes cannot get courses when they need them. Moreover, the library, while the best in the state and excellent in national standing, is deficient in a few areas.

The university and the department have adopted excellent standards for faculty promotions, but, as with other comparable departments, they have not come to a suitable position regarding the promotion of faculty who contribute in areas other than scholarly publications. So too must they continue to work on problems related to salaries. High salaries have been used to attract

distinguished scholars, but other extremely able scholars in the department do not receive the salaries they are truly worth. Yet the faculty has been admirably understanding in accepting the sacrifices that must be made in the interest of raising the department to national prominence. Eventually, however, the great disparities must be addressed, and this will require additional funding or reallocations of resources within the university.

Records of scholarly productivity by many of the history faculty are indeed impressive, but others indicate that the Department must continue to encourage comparable performance or early retirement by those who have not kept pace with the progress of the department. On the whole, this is a very strong department, and it has come a long way in a brief period of time. It deserves the continuing support of the administration as it strives to attain the goal of national prominence, which appears to be within its reach.

Major Recommendations:

A. Devote special attention to an evaluation of the undergraduate survey courses and their place in general education and develop a clear statement of rationale accordingly.

B. Strengthen the program for history majors, perhaps through a requirement of pro-seminars in historical methods and historiography and a senior seminar in which a substantial paper is produced mainly from primary sources, and increase expectations for more writing in advanced courses for undergraduates.

C. Require more reading seminars or colloquia for graduate students; elevate standards for admission of graduate students; and increase stipends for assistantships for more graduate students.

D. After the appointment of a senior Europeanist, work specifically to recruit more graduate students in European history.

E. Explore ways to cover courses in essential fields whenever faculty are on leave for research.

F. Endeavor to find ways to reward and promote present faculty who contribute to the success of the department through means other than through scholarly productivity, but, for all newer faculty, adhere rigorously to standards of promotion and tenure based upon expectations for excellence in research as well as in teaching and professional service.

G. Hire young new faculty members and expect comparable performance by older faculty in terms of meeting the expectations of a history department that is rapidly changing and growing in professional stature.

H. Work closely with the administration to solicit support for more comparable salaries for the many able and accomplished history faculty who are paid appreciably less than the newer, distinguished faculty and than colleagues of equal attainments in sister departments in other parts of the region.

SOCIOLOGY IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

Russell R. Dynes

SUS OVERVIEW

I. Introduction

The review and evaluation of programs in sociology with which this report is concerned is based on an overall assessment of both undergraduate and graduate programs within institutions which are a part of the State University System of Florida (SUS). The consultant team was concerned with the overall effectiveness of the programs and their place within the particular context of each campus. It tried to view each program as an attempt on the part of the faculty of that institution to develop programs and to adapt them to changing public needs. The comments which are included in this report represent a distillation of views which were expressed by local consultants on each campus. The uniqueness of each institution in the system was considered--in history, in location, in mission--while at the same time, an attempt was made to try to base evaluations on national and rather universal standards.

There are departments or administrative units of sociology in all of the institutions in the State University System. In all of the institutions, B.A. degrees are awarded, and in two institutions (FSU and FAMU), B.S. degrees are also awarded. In five of the institutions, master's degree programs are in place, offering primarily the M.S. degree, as well as the M.A.T. and M.S. degrees. On many campuses, sociology departments are heavily involved in degree programs awarded in other administrative units. There are three Ph.D. programs on the books. Two of them are very viable at the University of Florida and Florida State University. There is a joint program between FAU and UF which has been relatively inactive.

On all campuses, sociology programs contribute heavily to the general educational requirements of the universities and also provide significant service to many other programs within the institutions. In fact in some instances, the obligations for service courses constitute a serious threat to the integrity of sociology programs themselves. Of course, many introductory sociology courses are provided by community colleges and when students transfer into the SUS, a primary focus of their interests is on upper division courses. In many respects, the programs in sociology in the SUS have become well integrated into the pattern of higher education within the state and by a number of measures, such programs are successful.

In the section following, there is a general, but brief, discussion of sociology around each of the four broad issues defined by the social science coordinators prior to consultant visits. This discussion will provide useful background for subsequent analysis and recommendations for each institution in the State University System.

II. The Role of Sociology in the University

The role of sociology in the university reflects, in part, the rather widespread feeling that the discipline is both unappreciated and not well institutionalized within higher education. While the feeling of being unappreciated is perhaps universal and cuts across every discipline in the system, there is some basis in fact for that feeling in the social sciences generally, and sociology in particular.

It is helpful to remember that in all of the major historical traditions to influence American higher education, the social sciences, sociology included, have been less than central. From the earliest classics/humanities tradition, largely British in origin, to the later "scientific" tradition

modeled on the physical and biological worlds, the social world was perceived as unknowable, perhaps even irrelevant. This meant that as American higher education developed, the social sciences were rather suspended between the humanities tradition and the "scientific" tradition.

There were, and are, differences, of course, in how the respective social sciences are viewed by others within the Academy. Psychology, for example, fits well those American values which emphasized individualism and with those later trends which emphasized our preoccupations with self. And the business of economics often became business and those who controlled our economic destinies were called economists. Anthropologists had the advantage of dealing with the distant and the exotic, while at the same time providing proof that presumed eternal truths were not necessarily eternal nor true, and that the social world was more complex than those who took it for granted. Characterizations of sociology, on the other hand, have ranged from "dangerous" to "irrelevant," all of which suggests that consistency has not necessarily been an academic virtue.

Despite the differences in tradition and perception just noted, sociology and the other social sciences long have been standard fixtures in American higher education. As Dr. Gallaher notes in his overview comments, taken collectively the social sciences represent the mirror that we hold up to examine ourselves and what we are about. Their claim to importance thus rests on the fact that whenever and wherever people exist in the modern world, they do not, indeed they cannot, assume that the "world" is their private affair, but rather it is one shared by others. Understanding this very simple, seemingly trivial point, provides the basis, then, for the relevance of the social sciences as a major element in general education.

As just stated, the issue of general education is especially salient in Florida at this time for two reasons: (1) in building curricula at new and growing institutions, such as many of those in the Florida system, issues of general education emerge, often expressed in distribution requirements or in the addition of new curricula; and (2) currently there is national concern for the revision of general education requirements. While the aforementioned may be traumatic for the faculty and administrators who become involved, it will be argued here that raising the question, "What is an educated person in the modern world?" is one for which the social sciences can contribute significant answers. And that question needs to be raised periodically. The sociological perspective is essential in any consideration of what general education should be.

III. Sociology in the Professional Schools

The second issue raised by the social science coordinators concerns the relationship between their disciplines and the professional schools. While there are many dimensions to this issue, only one will be highlighted here. I refer to the fact that while professional schools and vocationally-oriented programs frequently find sociology relevant for their curricula, their enthusiasm sometimes translates to negative consequences for the basic discipline. This may occur when professional schools:

(1) have the resources to appoint faculty and do so without any consultation with the disciplinary department;

(2) utilize persons trained in other fields to teach sociology courses predicated on the assumption that anyone can teach such courses;

(3) repackage disciplinary courses and give them another title and thus duplicate courses;

(4) attempt to dictate time of offering for required disciplinary courses; and

(5) exact priorities on departmental courses without providing any new or substitute resources.

While none of these problems are easy to solve, especially since they cut across many different institutional arrangements, THE PRIMARY PLANNING GUIDELINE IN SUCH MATTERS SHOULD BE TO GIVE CENTRAL VALUE TO THE DISCIPLINARY BASE RATHER THAN ON THE VOCATIONAL APPLICATION. Vocational contributions cannot continue without support to the discipline itself, and applied faculty must keep in constant touch with disciplinary trends. It is our view that in several Florida institutions, basic disciplines have been severely compromised when primary attention and resources have been devoted to the vocational applications of the discipline.

IV. Research and Funding for Research

The third broad, statewide issue relates to the amount of research conducted and the amount of outside funding available. On the latter issue it should be noted that opportunities for sociological research funding are limited in comparison with the opportunities available to some other social science disciplines (e.g., Psychology and Economics), and is minuscule compared to the types of funding for basic research in the biological and physical sciences. A further point to keep in mind is that of differential availability to various sociological specialties, with some so restricted as to make it unrealistic to anticipate persons working in them to generate major research grants.

Federal funding for sociological research is concentrated in the National Science Foundation, certain programs of the Department of Justice, and various

institutes administered by the Departments of Health and Human Services. The policies of these agencies are such that Federal funding is more likely for some specialties than for others. For example, sociologists working in criminology, deviance, demography, and the sociology of mental health and medical sociology have greater opportunities for such funds than do other sociological specialties. While the Sociology Program of the National Science Foundation does not limit its research support to selected specialties, its funds are limited, the competition is intense, and certain research styles typically fare poorly in the competition for funds. There is also some limited funding for research for more humanistically oriented sociologists from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Funding for sociological research from private foundations is more varied and also more limited in amount as well as very heavily concentrated on applied problems that have little potential for scholarly publication.

Two issues mentioned in the overview of the Social Sciences that are of particular relevance to the sociologists in the Florida system should be reiterated here. The first of these is the concern registered on most campuses regarding the treatment of research overhead. While this is a complicated issue and the degrees of freedom available seldom are great, CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO MAKING MORE USE OF OVERHEAD FUNDS AS RESEARCH INDUCEMENTS FOR FACULTY WHOSE MERITORIOUS EFFORTS TO OBTAIN FUNDING MAY OTHERWISE NOT BE SUCCESSFUL SIMPLY BECAUSE OF THE LIMITED AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING AND THE INTENSE COMPETITION FOR SAME.

The second issue has to do with the changing mission of some institutions in the system. Some sociology faculty recruited early in the history of certain institutions claim that the expectations presented to them at the time were that they were to function mainly as teachers. Some now feel that

changes over time in the institutional mission to increasingly emphasize faculty responsibility for continued research and scholarly activity represent a "betrayal" of the original "conditions" of employment. The point here is not to assess the merits of those claims but to indicate the existence of a considerable segment of the faculty at some institutions who will have special difficulty in developing a research record. Their presence perhaps underscores the importance of giving increased attention to faculty development.

V. Faculty Development

Partly because of the change in mission in some institutions, noted above, and partly because of improvements in research techniques, such as the use of computing, there is concern among many of the sociology faculty for more explicit attention to be devoted to faculty improvement. Viewed another way, GREATER ATTENTION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO TEACHING IMPROVEMENT AT RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES AND GREATER ATTENTION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO RESEARCH SKILLS AT "TEACHING" INSTITUTIONS. This recommendation suggests that the need in these areas may be greater than can be realized through the sabbatical process.

VI. Sociology in the SUS

Before proceeding to discussion and recommendations on each of the SUS institutions, and keeping in mind the background materials just presented, a few observations and recommendations applicable to sociology in the SUS are in order. Before so doing, however, we should note that the recommendations made by Dr. Gallaher in his overview of the SUS are supported firmly by the data from sociology.

The departments of sociology in the SUS are in relatively good condition. It is our impression that the departments are composed of dedicated faculty

who do good teaching with a diverse student population, and that faculty have been sensitive to local institutional needs. In fact, SOCIOLOGY MAY HAVE BEEN TOO RESPONSIVE IN RESPONDING TO SERVICE COURSES AND APPLIED PROGRAMS SO THAT THEY HAVE UNDERMINED SOME OF THE AUTONOMY WHICH THE DISCIPLINE SHOULD HAVE WITHIN THE INSTITUTION. As noted previously, sociology is a perspective which attempts to understand social life carefully and critically, and thus should take its place with other intellectual perspectives within the academy. By being responsive in growing institutions during a period of high vocationalism, and with little tradition of general education, sociologists have given too little attention to the foundations of their discipline, and administrators have found them useful for other educational purposes.

VII. Recommendations:

1. Given the adequate coverage of sociology as reflected in the diverse institutions within the SUS, THE EMPHASIS IN THE FUTURE SHOULD BE TO STRENGTHEN EXISTING PROGRAMS RATHER THAN THE INITIATION OF NEW ONES.
2. With limited exceptions and only under very special circumstances, THAT NEW GRADUATE PROGRAMS NOT BE INITIATED, even though there may be significant local pressures to do so.
3. THAT THE UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR PROGRAMS IN SOCIOLOGY BE MAINTAINED AND STRENGTHENED; and
4. THAT THE INTEGRITY OF DISCIPLINARY DEPARTMENTS AND DISCIPLINARY OFFERINGS BE GIVEN HIGH VALUE.
5. THAT THE RECRUITMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF FACULTY RECEIVE CONSTANT ATTENTION.
6. THAT SUPPORT SERVICES FOR FACULTY TEACHING AND RESEARCH BE GIVEN HIGH PRIORITY AND CONTINUALLY UPDATED.

INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS IN SOCIOLOGY

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Degrees Offered in Sociology: Ph.D., M.S., M.A., B.S., B.A.

Overall Findings

FSU has the highest proportion of graduate students in the SUS and it also has a strong liberal arts undergraduate tradition. The Department of Sociology is the third largest (as measured by student enrollments and by faculty size) in the College of Social Sciences. The vast majority of undergraduate students come from Florida, while in recent years the majority of graduate students have come from outside the state. The Sociology Department has traditionally been the strongest in the SUS in methodology, marriage and the family, and demography. In the last several years, there has been an increasing emphasis on two additional areas of faculty concentration: political economy and aging. While the department maintains some visibility on the "social problems" areas, deviance as well as race and ethnic relations have declined in their emphasis with the department.

While there has been a long tradition of significant national visibility by the department, much of that reputation was produced by faculty who are no longer at FSU. However, the current faculty have not only maintained that prior tradition, but have the potential to enhance it. Much of the credit for recent recruitment should be given to the former chair, and the current chair.

The quality of the faculty can be measured by a number of factors; including national and international reputations based on professional publications, presentations, service on editorial boards and grants.

The graduate program is of high quality with a solid core curriculum of methods and theory aimed at achieving critical evaluation and skill in research design and data analysis. There is generally high quality of admitted graduate students and of adequate placement of Ph.D's in both academic and non-academic positions.

The undergraduate program at FSU has experienced some decline in enrollment, but it seems to have hit a low point in 1984 and has been on the rise since. There are 93 undergraduate majors. Some of the overall increases have been the result of recent curriculum changes intended to better meet current student needs.

The department participates in several interdisciplinary programs both on a graduate and undergraduate level. The department also has recently made a major commitment to develop a significant honors program. In addition, the department has been innovative in the development of "writing courses."

In working with interdisciplinary programs, departments often have difficulty in maintaining disciplinary integrity. The elimination of ISR has helped this tension somewhat, and current relations between the department and the Population Studies Program seem to be improving, but still need continuing attention.

In summary, the department has improved in recent years and continues as a strong undergraduate and graduate program. On the graduate level, the new concentrations in political economy and aging now emerging are important curricular innovations. The undergraduate programs are solid and the faculty is attentive to change and trends. Faculty morale is high although they feel that the department has been underappreciated by the "administration."

Recommendations:

1. The department should be used as an example of what can be accomplished with Quality Improvement Funds. It would make a good example of the value and the results of such a program.
2. Since the department has developed a productive faculty who are increasingly visible, significant attention should be given to faculty salary level since the department is very "raidable." To replace some of them would be much more costly financially, as well as intellectually, than to reward them now.
3. It would be prudent to increase support for certain graduate student categories. Good faculty like to work with good graduate students, and good graduate students need to be recruited nationally.
4. Continued attention should be given by the administration to issues relating to departments that represent core disciplines and "applied" research centers. Generally, at the heart of such tension is the fact that applied centers could not exist without disciplinary contributions, but that there is little reward or control given to the discipline. (The issue is more than equity, since it relates also to the nature of knowledge and its application. But even attention to equity issues would be sufficient.)
5. There are certain latent faculty strengths which, with some encouragement, could be developed into an important resource. There are several faculty with strength in the sociology of education who do not seem to know those in the College of Education.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Degrees Offered in Sociology: Ph.D., M.A.T., M.A., B.A.

Overall Findings

The department attracts very diverse undergraduate students to both its larger introductory courses and as undergraduate majors. While the development of certain interdisciplinary programs has drawn off some students who would have been sociology majors in other situations, the number of undergraduate students now stands at over 200. Most credits are in service courses for other liberal arts curricula, for distribution requirements, and for professional school students, all seeking a sociological perspective. The curriculum is fairly rigorous and grounded in the major specialties.

There seems to be consensus that the quality of classroom instruction is unusually high throughout the department. There are considerable concerns about the current support that is given within the university for good teaching.

The Department of Sociology is very understaffed and is very small compared with research universities in the country. Part of the understaffing is due to the fact that sociologists are actively involved in various interdisciplinary programs without sufficient attention given to maintaining a strong basic department. While such involvement may underscore the utility of sociological knowledge in such programs, it also may underscore the lack of appreciation for the integrity of the basic discipline. In its own right, a strong sociology program is vital to the building of a major research university.

In general, the graduate programs in sociology are adequate. There are some tendencies for graduate students to gravitate toward the specialties

where research grants and high scholarly activities are primarily located. Support, however, is somewhat minimal for a major graduate department.

The faculty is probably more balanced than many other major research universities in instructional performance, general scholarly activity, and professional involvement. It is not as strong as it should be in publishing scholarly articles, securing research dollars, and gaining national recognition.

Recommendations:

1. It is important to strengthen a good department to the level of quality appropriate to a major research university. There needs to be a strong sociological core faculty which will attract other faculty who would be useful in applied and professional programs.
2. The department has the opportunity to make significant changes in the next several years. That change process would be facilitated by making efforts to engage the faculty in departmental planning for the future. Such a planning effort would allow a reintroduction of optimism for the future within the department, and the completed document would provide guidance for replacement and enlargement of faculty.
3. There is a significant opportunity for departmental change in future recruitment. At the same time, the topic of recruitment represents a potential vulnerability which may result in conditions which cause additional loss of faculty and erosion of the program. The recruitment of top notch faculty may take several years of "conversation." Recruitment is very difficult to accomplish when faculty lines are not available until the last minute, even though the vacancies might have been anticipated for several years. In the absence of a departmental

planning document, the suggestion might be made for recruitment in the areas of complex organization, occupations, social policy, comparative political economy, and modernization and world systems. Other possibilities would include social demography, medical sociology, and Latin American Studies. The recruitment of top scholars cannot be done on a "vacancy next year" basis. The department will be losing visible scholars, and replacement at the assistant professor level is not a viable alternative. Attention should also be given to the present gender and ethnic imbalance of the department in future recruitment. In addition, the recruitment of nationally-visible scholars will be less probable if there is not increased support for hiring graduate assistants from the national market.

4. Attention should be given to the possibilities for increased faculty productivity which can come from adequate word processing, copier equipment, and basic financial support for participation at professional meetings. National visibility is difficult when it is unlikely that faculty can get out of the state. In addition, faculty productivity and recognition are limited by the lack of reasonable teaching assistance for large and intensive classes, the great time investment necessary for data analysis, and the absense of classrooms equipped to handle contemporary visual aids.

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

Degrees: M.A., B.A.

Overall Findings

The university is defined as an urban, research-oriented university emphasizing quality undergraduate and graduate teaching, basic and applied research, and public service. The Sociology Department serves, primarily through its introductory courses, a significant number of undergraduates, and contributes significantly to general education. It seems, however, that other than these accomplishments, sociology is not well integrated into an institutional conception of liberal arts.

The structure of the sociology major is both typical and sound. The core courses, along with the required statistics course, provide a very good base for the discipline. The electives cover most of the important sub-fields in the discipline. The department may wish, however, to give a "second" course in selected fields to provide a greater depth than is possible with survey courses. The recent addition of an elective internship is important and useful, but often faculty underestimate the amount of time needed in the supervision of internship programs. The minor program in sociology is soundly designed. The master's degree program in applied sociology is also innovative, but at the present time underenrolled.

Small departments, especially those sponsoring graduate programs, are usually pushed to the limits of their staff resources. This, in part, reflects the larger university context in which resources are scarce and recent allocations have been directed to disciplines other than the social sciences. There are also tensions which have been created by changes in institutional missions. The sociology faculty, in the past, has had a strong

record of community service. However, many faculty feel that teaching and community service are no longer valued, although those values were the primary basis of their original recruitment.

Overall, the program is strong. The department is short staffed and somewhat lacks understanding of the long-term mission of the university. There is a new chair who seems to have the confidence of the department and administration. This provides the opportunity for strengthening an already strong program. Future retirements will also allow for change by adding faculty who haven't accomodated lower levels of support and thus have greater expectations for faculty support services.

Recommendations

1. There should be a more effective attempt to integrate sociology into the general educational program of the university.
2. There is the opportunity for strengthening the department by giving support and encouragement to the new chair.
3. The replacement of lost faculty lines is essential. The justification for those losses (i.e., declining enrollment) create the conditions for further decline.
4. In general, support services for teaching are inadequate. Greater attention to teaching and resource support is necessary. Audio visual aids are especially important in the social sciences. Classroom space is barely adequate. Library resources, especially at the graduate level, are minimal. Better student access to computer facilities, and better support services through software and programming by those knowledgeable about social science needs, are necessary to encourage faculty research.

5. In future recruitment, the age distribution of the faculty should be considered. There will be no particular advantage in replacing an "old" department with a "young" department. At certain points, recruitment should occur at higher ranks or the department will be in danger of losing its imminence.

6. Special attention should be given to faculty development needs. Changes in institutional mission have created considerable faculty uncertainty and a consequent loss of morale and productivity. Some faculty believe that teaching and community service are no longer valued, and others believe that there is inadequate support to encourage research expectations.

7. The department sponsors a chaper of the American Sociology Association (ASA) honors program, a national organizaiton which serves undergraduate students across the country and assists in their professional socialization. The department receives considerable national recognition for this effort. This is an unusual opportunity and should be continued. The resources allocated to that program result in an important payoff to the department and the university.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

Degrees offered: M.A., B.A.

Overall Findings

The university is defined as a comprehensive, multi-campus, metropolitan, four-year undergraduate and graduate research university. The Department of Sociology is one of 90 degree granting entities within the university. It is one of the largest departments within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and has more faculty than all but three departments within the College. It generates more student credit hours per faculty member than all but one of the departments. There are 282 undergraduate sociology majors and 31 graduate students. The department is well integrated into the curriculum at the university. The quality of teaching ranges from good to very good.

While the department has a significant teaching and research record, there is the feeling that they have not been properly rewarded for this in the past. Some of the younger faculty, including a newly recruited member, and a number of older faculty have impressive records of scholarly activity. Overall, a relatively small number of faculty have exhibited this level of productivity. This has created a layered effect within the department. One layer is composed of faculty recruited in the 60s and early 70s who reflect the goals of the university at that time when the primary focus was on teaching. A second layer, primarily but not exclusively, composed of younger faculty, wish to focus on teaching, research, and professional involvement. This "division" creates considerable difficulty in achieving consensus on the direction of departmental activity. It also creates a situation when the most productive faculty may seek opportunities elsewhere. The division is also exacerbated by the multi-campus teaching responsibilities.

A major theme which runs through most of the problems of the department is that the changing mission of the university has not been properly "communicated" to the department, and while the faculty in the department has contributed significantly to the teaching mission of the university, they feel that they have not been properly recognized or rewarded. Lack of support for the current graduate program reinforces that feeling.

Recommendations:

1. The department should reduce the size of some of the classes.
2. There is a need to provide more research and computer space for instructional and research space. This would increase faculty productivity and provide a wider range of educational experiences in differing educational formats for undergraduate students.
3. There should be considerably more graduate student support. This would help the department to recruit more widely and would allow the program to have more full time students. Increases in such support would have exponential effects on faculty and student morale.
4. Greater flexibility should be given to the chair to make individualized faculty assignments. Many of the department members have been professionally active in spite of the present confining system; however, some faculty need time off to start or to maintain their professional activity.
5. It may be a good investment to hire a consultant to assist the department in achieving a consensus on its future direction. The function of the consultant would be more to guarantee the "process" rather than to provide content and direction. (This is predicated on the idea that the

level of current frustration is sufficient to make internal communication difficult.)

6. While the university has the potential for additional graduate programs, support needs to be given first to strengthening the M.A. program. In the past, the department produced students who went on to good graduate schools. At this time, it may be better to redirect the program focus toward a "terminal" applied program at the masters level.
7. Attention should be given to faculty support services, such as the improvement of library holdings and computer services.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Degrees: B.A.

Overall Findings

FIU is a comprehensive, urban, and multi-campus institution offering a broad array of undergraduate and graduate programs located in the state's largest population center. The Department of Sociology and Anthropology at FIU is unique among both sociology and anthropology departments in the U.S. First, the faculty has interests which relate to the unique problems of the region and the city. Second, the members of the department have been unusually productive for a young teaching institution. Third, the orientation of the faculty who have been recruited has minimized interdisciplinary conflict. The sociologists tend to be comparatively oriented, and the anthropologists are social anthropologists.

At present, sociology/anthropology is not sufficiently represented in the general degree requirements at FIU. The department is well equipped to serve a larger role, but it has not been adequately utilized. In addition, there is the need for bachelor-level graduates to work in social service agencies, especially those dealing with ethnic populations. There is also a need for advanced level training in the area.

It is clear that the department lacks certain standard resources; this is compounded by the diffusion of resources in a multi-campus university. In addition, there is a necessity to provide support for the faculty members to keep up with their own disciplines as well as keeping in touch with developments in other countries. (Many of the faculty are Latin American or Caribbean specialists.)

Because the cosmopolitan nature of the faculty creates unusual demands on the library, a strong research library is essential for those who are foreign area specialists. This demand cannot be solved by a statewide interlibrary loan service. Other faculty resources are also needed; for example, computers should gain the same status as telephones and office space.

The curriculum is strong but could be strengthened. Many of the offerings now are specialized upper-division courses, which reflect the past concentration on upper-division courses and lack of attention to general education.

The department currently has very strong leadership and good access to the university administration. The considerable progress which has been made during the department chair's tenure bodes well for the future.

Recommendations:

1. The current departmental major is adequate but perhaps has some courses which are overspecialized. Greater attention should be given to general education programs and the graduate program. The more specialized courses whould be confined to the graduate level.
2. The faculty is strong and unique. The program should continue to integrate the disciplines of sociology/anthropology. Future recruitment should continue to follow departmental needs rather than disciplinary guidelines.
3. Departmental resources--office space, research space, library resources, computer facilities, and office equipment--need to be strengthened. The duality of the faculty reference groups--both discipline and area--require additional resources.

4. Given the ethnic mix in the community and university and given the state's plan for its economic and cultural future, this consultant supports the lead consultant's recommendation for a special center. There is an excellent opportunity for the development of a unique graduate program at FIU. One approach would be to build up from an M.A. program; however, sometimes isolated M.A. programs do not flourish. A Ph.D. degree program would require a greater investment, but might be phased in over a period of time. That lag time would give the department time to plan and to gain experience in graduate education. This is a unique opportunity to build a significant program which could have national recognition.

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY

Degrees: Ph.D., M.A.T., M.A., B.A.

Overall Findings

FAU was founded as an upper division and graduate university. More recently, it enrolled its first freshmen class. The Sociology Department is somewhat unique because it offers separate majors in sociology and social psychology. Currently there are 55-65 social psychology majors and 30-35 sociology majors. The department has seen its role as preparing undergraduates for graduate education or the general job market. The undergraduate major program is a strong one, but facing complications presented by the necessity of offering a major at the Broward campus.

The affiliated Ph.D. program was inactive. No one ever completed a joint Ph.D. and the program was terminated by the BOR this year. Between 1973-82 there were over a dozen M.A.'s awarded with the students going on to very high quality graduate programs out of the state. Graduate instruction is often on a tutorial basis with contributed faculty time.

The eight departmental faculty have earned Ph.D.'s and are tenured. Three have excellent research careers; three publish with some regularity, and the two social psychologists are popular teachers. The departmental standard for teaching is quite strong. Most recently, a sociologist has been awarded the Morrow Chair of Social Science, but as of now is minimally involved in departmental affairs.

This is a remarkably good faculty and their work in the past achieved national attention for research and the production of graduate students for other programs. This faculty also has had the reputation for extensive non-classroom support for its graduate students. Presently, it tends to be a

rather demoralized department. There is the feeling that there is a lack of university resources to support research activity, e.g., computer facilities, space, and return of overhead. In effect, the department feels that, in the past, it has had a good record of achieving institutional goals, but was not rewarded for such a record. They are rather pessimistic for the future.

Recommendations

This department is difficult to understand and change. In the past, it was generally defined as the best department among the new universities in Florida. The research ethos is one which most other new SUS universities are trying to emulate. Perhaps some of this tradition can be reclaimed in the following ways.

1. There should be some structural changes designed to reduce the domination of applied programs within the College of Social Sciences. It is at least a reasonable hypothesis that in the desire to achieve vocational aims, applied programs have come to dominate the basic disciplines. This has led to duplication of courses, and as a consequence, lesser-qualified faculty teach less-demanding courses of repackaged disciplinary content. Rewarding these less-qualified faculty with tenure and administrative responsibility in turn perpetuates that process.
2. College resources should be directed toward providing the minimum facilities for sociological research. The previous funding which came to the department from outside is now much more difficult to obtain. The decline in available outside funding, however, should be recognized and additional institutional support should be augmented in areas of importance which are no longer funded externally.

3. The data analysis facilities should be updated (hardware terminals, PC's, a data archives facility), and college programmers who understand social science problems should be employed.
4. The faculty could use two new positions-one to handle the overload that the Broward campus creates, and one to function as a methodologist/statistician.
5. Some consideration should be given to reducing the intellectual and geographical isolation of the faculty. This might take the form of visiting lecturers, expenses for faculty to take some summer training courses, facilitation of contacts with nearby graduate programs, and/or support for travel to professional meetings.
6. The faculty needs to continue to consider adaptations in its major programs to accommodate students who are more vocationally, than academically, oriented to graduate school.

UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA

Degrees: B.A.

Overall Findings

The University of West Florida is a lower and upper division, graduate and multi-campus institution. The multi-campus, around the clock scheduling, and the demands for interdisciplinary and service courses create tremendous demands on a small faculty. One gets the impression that over the years, the department has been accommodating to the general institutional needs, but thus has diffused its own interests and energies from building and sustaining a stable and coherent major. They have also required too many specific courses so that scheduling those required courses exhausts faculty energies. Consequently, there is very little time to offer electives.

The strongest feature of the department is in its quality and caliber of teaching. The faculty has a good deal of depth and commitment. The faculty, most of whom were recruited early in the institution's history, have good ties with local community colleges.

Recommendations:

1. The department has been too willing to help other programs and departments, and consequently has diffused its own efforts to provide a coherent major. This can be rectified by additional faculty lines. It is my impression that the sociology program is not only cost effective, but the department provides significant resources to other programs which are not recognized.
2. There may be some psychological benefit in the development of a proposed masters degree program in social studies.

3. There should be expanded opportunities for faculty development. This would have a payoff in developing new skills for the faculty, but also may be more valuable in preventing the faculty burnout.
4. Since there is a tendency to view sociology as only helpful to applied programs, careful attention should be given by the administration to see sociology as an integral and necessary part of the liberal arts curriculum.
5. Providing computers to faculty for student instruction is a necessary step which will encourage future curriculum innovation.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

Degrees: B.A.

Overall Findings

The University of North Florida is a regional, public institution whose function is to provide a range of undergraduate and beginning graduate programs for Northeast Florida. It began as an upper-level university and, in 1982, expanded its mission with the addition of lower-division programs.

The sociology program is located in the Department of Political Science and Sociology which offers programs in anthropology, criminal justice, sociology, political science, public administration, and social welfare. The undergraduate major program is very appropriate, and its core of three theory and methods courses is very reasonable. By contrast, the social sciences are under-represented in the UNF general education plan.

The faculty is surprisingly strong, each with the appropriate terminal degree. They have remained professionally active--some through publications, and others by professional service. There are good indications that it is a strong teaching department heavily involved in service to the department and the university. Many have strong community connections. Many of the faculty, however, feel pressure to expand more effort on research.

The complexity of the department might seem to suggest the need for some administrative simplification. But it is important to stress here that it is encouraging to see the teaching of allied subjects such as social welfare, criminal justice, and public administration within academic units that offer sociology, political science, and anthropology. Maintaining the bond between pure and applied social sciences is difficult but important. The department seems to serve the needs of the region very well.

Recommendations:

1. Sociology needs to be better institutionalized along with the other social sciences in the general education curriculum.
2. The complex departmental structure should be maintained to keep strong disciplinary programs at the center of applied programs, and attempts to split off applied programs should be resisted. The best control on the intellectual content of applied programs comes from faculty who keep their disciplinary ties. Structurally that is more likely to occur in a complex department.
3. A necessity for maintaining such a complex structure is good faculty recruitment. The department could use a good methodologist with some interest in evaluation research and a good organizational theorist. They would be helpful to the disciplinary programs and essential to keeping the curricula of applied programs intellectually honest.
4. The major problem with such a complex structure is faculty burnout. One preventive measure would be some resources for faculty development. This might take the form of support for research that goes somewhat beyond the current seed grant program. Many faculty feel some tension in this area. Other funding might try to provide opportunities for increasing faculty skills.
5. The department might need to give attention to its major program. There may be too many required courses, especially if the department gets locked into required courses in applied curricula. Some courses, such as Human Interaction, may have reflected some past faculty interest. Such individual interests should not be locked into a continuing curriculum as a required course. To maintain the complex structure, constant attention needs to be given to refining course offerings.

FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY

Degrees Offered: M.A.S.S., B.A., B.S.

Overall Findings

The university is principally an undergraduate land grant institution founded in 1887 to provide post-secondary education to Florida's black citizens. In 1948, the university created a major program in sociology. Because of the diversity of programs available in the department over time, the name was changed to the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Human Services. In 1985, the name was changed again to the Department of Sociology, Criminal Justice, and Social Welfare.

The undergraduate major program consists of seven basic core courses plus electives in six different subject areas. In addition, the introductory course is required by most of the colleges in the university as part of their general education requirements.

During the early 1970s, it is estimated that perhaps ten percent of the total student body majored in sociology. Currently, there are 51 majors. This drastic decline is consistent with increases in vocationalism, which is currently strong. In addition, FAMU had a reputation in the past of sending a number of students on to graduate school, but this too seems to have declined.

The department participates in a Masters of Applied Social Sciences program. The research sequence in the department is especially strong. The faculty appears to be well trained, although many of them hold terminal degrees that are not in sociology. Overall, they have a good teaching reputation, and most are professionally active in some fashion. Much of the departmental operating funds have in recent years come from external grants. While this is a welcome addition, it should not be a substitute for internal

support. The department has some hope of major participation in a projected Center for Minority Aging and, consequently, of strengthening its offerings in gerontology.

Recommendations:

1. The department, which currently is located in several different places on the campus, needs to be located together. Faculty cohesion is essential in trying to implement a complex and diffuse set of offerings.
2. The department has a strong research sequence which is constantly being frustrated by the lack of computer facilities or even access to computers. Perhaps one of the reasons for the decline of students going on to graduate school is the lack in this support service. In addition, the support of laboratory assistants is necessary so that faculty can restrict their efforts to teaching research methods and content rather than teaching techniques.
3. New courses should be developed which also would be useful to Social Welfare and Criminal Justice students.
4. The department should make a concerted effort to be included in the general education requirements of other colleges and programs. It may be that the past high enrollments in sociology have retarded departmental efforts to consider courses which would be relevant to other programs.
5. Recruitment of future faculty should emphasize more standardized disciplinary training. There seems to be some pattern of retaining "substitute" faculty rather than recruiting for specific needs.
6. It would be prudent to recruit a medical sociologist with the new program in Pharmacy (Pharm.D.) and for other program needs around the university.

7. In general, both classroom facilities and departmental support services are very inadequate. These are not frills, but essentials for adequate education and faculty performance.

MASTER'S IN DEMOGRAPHY PROGRAM AT

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Art Gallaher

THE MASTER'S DEGREE IN DEMOGRAPHY
AT THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

I. The Setting

The Master's in Demography Program is part of Florida State University's Center for the Study of Population. This multidisciplinary Center is known for excellence, nationally and internationally, in several areas: the demography of aging, demography of health, infant and child mortality, and international studies in demography. Before developing the master's level program under review, the Center's degree efforts were confined to Ph.D. level work. Two years ago, however, the Master's in Demography Program was introduced into the Center's inventory, only the fourth such program in the country. The others are found at the University of California-Berkeley, the University of Pennsylvania, and Georgetown. There is no comparable program in the South.

II. The Program

The Master's in Demography program is intended to produce students with marketable skills to satisfy needs for special expertise in many business operations, and at virtually all levels of government. Graduates from this program receive a Certificate in Demography, and though they work and study alongside those seeking the Ph.D. degree, their professional objectives are such that duplication is not an issue. The program thus makes efficient use of a curriculum and faculty already in place and well established. The special career objective noted is differentiated by the requirement of a Master's paper.

Special Concerns:

(1) Local consultant expresses some concern that this practice currently may be tilting too much toward conventional academic training (see Recommendation A). Generally, however, the consultant reports the curriculum is sound, that its objectives are clear and attainable, and projects, though only in its second year, success of an order similar to that now enjoyed by the Ph.D. option. The lead consultant supports these observations, noting the development of this program to be an innovative and progressive move. Of special note, and commendation, is the faculty effort to involve students heavily in professional activities of the kind that prepare them best for later professional independence.

III. The Faculty

The faculty of the Center for Population Study, drawn from a variety of departments, but especially from Economics and Sociology, serve this program. This is an outstanding faculty, all from leading institutions in the country, active in teaching, sponsored research, and publishing. The faculty is also involved heavily in advisory service roles to government and international agencies.

Special Concerns:

(1) Given quality standards of the faculty, and the program spread attempted by the Center, this faculty is stretched (see Recommendation B). Even with the work loads indicated, it should be noted that students are very complimentary of faculty's availability and willingness to work with them.

IV. The Students

This is a highly selective program, admitting only seven students per year. All bring excellent academic and intellectual credentials to the program, and there is a good mix of domestic and foreign backgrounds. Students are aware they are in an extremely demanding program, and take pride in being up for it; morale is excellent.

Special Concern:

(1) Students express concern for inadequate space, overcrowded computer facilities, and insufficient computing consultation.

V. Comments

Since multidisciplinary centers typically float above disciplinary-based departmental units, there is always concern for how their activities relate to such units. In this case, the Center for Population Study represents strong program options built over strong departmental options, i.e., strength has begot strength, and that is as it should be. The result is an exemplary operation that brings great credit to the institution and to the state. In this situation, however, as in all similar activities and in all institutions, there are points of potential stress that require monitoring. These typically run to several equity-based concerns: (1) maintenance of strength between base and overlay programs; particularly as measured by (2) the distribution of faculty effort between these levels; (3) the management of indirect costs accruing to center-based contracts and grants; and (4) the natural competition for graduate students.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants observe that while it would be nice to believe this program is above such mundane potential, it is, as a matter of fact, not. Our

concern, then, is to remind those involved of the continuing need to monitor the stress points noted, and to ensure, thereby, management of the natural tensions therein short of these becoming conflict and thus negatively impacting program quality (see Recommendation C).

VI. Recommendations

A. That the CENTER FACULTY focus the Master's in Demography more on the use of demographic analysis for policy rated issues than to the testing of formal hypotheses; that students in the Master's program be encouraged to participate, at all stages, in the annual survey conducted by the Policy Science Center and funded by the College of Social Sciences;

B. That the CENTER ADMINISTRATION, given the program spread and work load of the faculty in Center programs, monitor carefully additional demands visited on the faculty by the Master's requirement of a special paper;

C. That the COLLEGE, CENTER, AND DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATIONS carefully monitor those logical points of tension between department and Center programs;

D. That the COLLEGE, CENTER, AND DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATIONS devote resource priorities over the next five years to strengthening existing programs rather than to the development of new ones.

GENERAL AND INTERDISCIPLINARY SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS

IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

GENERAL AND INTERDISCIPLINARY SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

INTRODUCTION

The General Social Science degree (sometimes referred to as Interdisciplinary) is offered by six universities: FSU (Bachelors & Masters); FAMU (Masters); USF (Bachelors); FAU (Bachelors); UWF (Bachelors); and UCF (Bachelors). As part of the Social Science program review, these universities conducted self studies of their general and interdisciplinary social science programs and submitted these self studies to the lead consultant. The following section highlights these programs.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

The Social Science Interdisciplinary Program (SSI) dates back to the early fifties. Administratively the SSI program spans the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Social Sciences, and eight departments (Anthropology, History, Economics, Geography, Political Science, Public Administration, Sociology, and Urban and Regional Planning). The program is the responsibility of a faculty member in the College of Social Sciences, who is designated as Director, assisted by the coordinator of Student Affairs and OPS student assistants. The degree is available at the main campus, the Panama City Campus and the Ithmus of Panama (under contract with the Department of Defense). This undergraduate interdisciplinary major requires the same number of total hours as other programs in the college (30 hours for the major plus 12 hours for a minor). An SSI major must take 42 semester hours, 18 in one

participating department, 12 from a second department, and another 12 from one or more of the remaining departments.

In 1985 there were 145 undergraduate and 3 graduate students enrolled. The number of graduates was 46 in 1984, 53 in 1985, and 53 in 1986.

At the graduate level, an interdepartmental program is offered that leads to the degree of Master of Arts or Master of Science. This program of study includes thirty-two semester hours. It includes one required course, 12-18 credits in one of the participating fields, and at least six semester hours in each of two additional social science fields. If the student is seeking certification as a junior college instructor, there is a requirement of 6-12 credits in professional preparation. Candidates for the M.A. must meet the university's foreign language requirement. There is a written comprehensive examination that may be followed by an oral exam.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

The Interdisciplinary program, focused around the social and behavioral sciences, was established at USF in the early 1960s. After several transitions, the program was assigned to the Division of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences in 1984. A faculty on undergraduate education has proposed, and the university has approved, a new curriculum for the program.

The requirements for the B.A. degree include the completion of 42 approved hours of course work from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, with a minimum of 30 hours at the 3000 level or above; complete 12 hours each in two cognates; and maintain a 2.0 grade point in SSI to graduate. There is a thesis option.

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY

The General Social Science major is designed to provide a degree program in the social sciences which will allow students to take courses in Anthropology, Criminal Justice, Economics, Health Administration and Social Work, Political Science, and Sociology and Social Psychology. The requirements are a minimum of forty credits of upper division work in at least three social science divisions with at least a 2.0 GPA; six credits in research, including one methodology course; a satisfactory grade on an ETS exam for reading proficiency in a foreign language; and one course in statistics of behavioral analysis.

FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY

The Masters in Applied Social Science (MASS) was established in 1975. It draws from the core areas of Economics, History and Geography, Political Science and Public Administration, Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology and Human Services. The program was designed to: (1) prepare individuals for service delivery careers; (2) prepare students for further graduate work in one or a combination of academic disciplines in the core areas; (3) prepare employed individuals for advancement opportunities; and, (4) provide an interdisciplinary education to broaden and deepen the perspective of individuals in society. The program is managed by a coordinator and is under the administration of the Dean of the Graduate School and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

The core of the MASS is composed of an interdisciplinary seminar, statistical methods, social science research methods, and grantsmanship. In addition to the core courses (12 hours), each student may choose three courses

(9 hours) in one of six disciplines. Two additional courses (6 hours) must be taken in one or more additional disciplines. During the last semester, the student must do an internship with an approved agency/department or complete a thesis.

The consultants were asked to evaluate the university's proposal for a Ph.D. degree in Applied Social Science. The consultants' conclusions appear in a separate section of this report.

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

The Bachelor of Science in the Social Sciences was initiated in 1976. The general requirements for the degree are completion of the general education program; completion of Gordon Rule requirements; completion of CLAST; meeting university requirements; achievement a 2.0 GPA. The student must complete a minimum of 15 semester hours in each of four Social Science disciplines and one research methods course.

UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA

The Social Science Interdisciplinary degree began in the early 1970s. There are several tracks within the program, they are: (1) the general track -- requires 12 hours in two social sciences and 9 in a third. In addition, students must complete either statistics in the Math department or data analysis in Sociology. Also required are a research methods course, one course in each of the eight social sciences, and a social science seminar. (2) the special track -- allows students to complete 24-27 hours in two social sciences and a minimum of 12 hours in a non-social science discipline. Students must also complete a course in either data analysis, statistics,

research methods, or an equivalent. (3) the pre-civil service track -- This program emphasizes courses in Political Science, Economics, and either Psychology or Sociology, and is geared toward preparing students for the Federal Service Exam. (4) the pastoral track -- This program emphasizes Psychology and Sociology with a combination of courses in Economics, History, Political Science, and Geography. (5) the social studies education track -- This program leads to the Florida State Teacher Certification and stresses History and Political Science with support courses in Georgraphy, Economics, and Sociology, and 26 hours in professional education courses. (6) the Behavioral Emphasis track -- A variation of the general track which was designed for the Pensacola Naval Air Station that offers base courses in Psychology, Sociology, and Social Work, along with the necessary support courses.

THE MASTER OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM AND PROPOSED PHD OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCE AT THE FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL UNIVERSITY

Art Gallaher

THE MASTER OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM AND PROPOSED PHD OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCE AT THE FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL UNIVERSITY

Art Gallaher

I. The Setting

The Master of Applied Social Science Program, begun in 1975, is part of the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Graduate Studies, Research, and Continuing Education. As is commonly true of multidisciplinary programs, this one has no standing faculty of its own; rather, it draws its resources, staff people, and other support from participating academic departments. The program is administered by a Coordinator who sees to advising, arranging for appropriate schedules, and setting up internships locations for the students.

II. The Program

The program is intended to produce students with skills and a knowledge base drawn from a broad spectrum of the social sciences. The expectation is that work in these areas will prepare students for (1) careers in social service delivery-agencies; (2) further graduate work in one or a combination of academic disciplines in the core program areas; (3) advancement opportunities for those already employed; and (4) a broadened and deepened perspective on society. While no other market supply nor demand studies have been made, evidence accumulated by the current Coordinator, covering the twenty-five students who have graduated since 1983, reveal three of unknown whereabouts, and only one of the remaining currently without a position.

Interviews with enrolled students and with recent alumni show them to be supportive of the present program. Currently there are forty-one students at various stages of growth in this option, with an estimated seventy-five percent of this number following a political science interest.

Special Concerns:

(1) The consultant suspects, without introducing value one way or the other, that the Master of Applied Social Science degree may well be substituted by some students for programs more typically thought of as public administration.

(2) The students, faculty, and consultants observe that computing availability is poor; facilities are inadequate for current levels of disciplinary and graduate program development.

An important feature of this program is the internship capping its completion. This type experience is considered valuable, even essential, for students going to action-type placements, and is, therefore, strongly encouraged in this type academic venture. Arranging intern locations, and supervising students in such activity, however, are as labor intensive as any activity in the academy.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants voice concern that the internship effort currently is vested in the program Coordinator, who must engage these responsibilities along with his teaching, research, and other coordinator roles.

(2) Consultants voice similar concern in those cases where students opt to write a thesis as partial fulfillment of the master's degree. (See Recommendation C.)

III. The Faculty

The modicum of success achieved by the Master of Applied Social Science Program owes much to the dedication of a small number of overworked faculty. Those who work with the students in this program, and at the same time make effort to do research, publish, and sustain their department-based general education and baccalaureate obligations, are commended. Most of the faculty have the Ph.D., and they represent some of the better degree programs in their respective fields. Faculty reputation for teaching is very good.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants observe that morale among faculty is very poor, with understaffing and salary considerations as major variables.

(2) Consultants note lack of incentives for faculty growth and development (see Recommendation A).

IV. The Students

Admission to the Master of Applied Social Science program is approved by a faculty committee. While most applicants are graduates of Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, there are students from other SUS institutions, from out of state students, and typically two to five foreign students enroll in the program. One particular population that deserves mention is the part-time group, made up mainly of government employees in the immediate area. Of note, there seems considerable movement out of program.

Special Concern

(1) Students are concerned that their professors are extremely busy; concern also was registered for lack of graduate assistance support, and for poor access to computing capability.

V. Comments

The imposition of a multidisciplinary, graduate degree program onto disciplinary-based undergraduate degrees typically is thought best when the latter are operating from a position of strength. To do it otherwise places the basic disciplines at risk, with subsequent deleterious effect for their baccalaureate and general education missions.

Special Concerns:

(1) Consultants are as one in their concern that this process of cannibalization is underway in the program noted. The demands on faculty are creating serious student/faculty ratio and scheduling problems in undergraduate curricular areas. In fact, consultants estimate, based on experience in their own institutions, that the disciplinary units currently need a minimum of six to eight faculty to bring them into sensible balance to meet program objectives at all levels. Consultants further agree that this already difficult situation would be exacerbated beyond repair should a doctoral program in applied social science be imposed (see Recommendation D).

VI. Recommendations

A. That the UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION develop programs for faculty development and renewal;

B. That the UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION allocate resources adequate to meet the needs of the Master of Applied Social Sciences Program;

C. That the COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION and PROGRAM COORDINATOR develop a standing thesis committee to advise students opting for the thesis track;

D. That the UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION not propose a Ph.D. program in applied social science; and

E. That the UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION seek whatever means possible--through reallocation or otherwise--to meet basic disciplinary needs currently in conflict with demands made by the Master of Applied Social Sciences Program.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ABBREVIATED CURRICULA VITAE OF LEAD CONSULTANTS

FOR

ANTHROPOLOGY, HISTORY, AND SOCIOLOGY

ART GALLAHER

PERSONAL

Born:	Oklahoma
Birthdate:	March 22, 1925
Married:	Dixie Clower, 1950; two children
Address:	3167 Roxburg Drive West, Lexington, KY 40503
Telephone:	(606) 223-8642

EDUCATION

Ph. D.	University of Arizona, 1956, Anthropology (Sociocultural)
M. A.	University of Oklahoma, 1951, Anthropology (Sociocultural)
B. A.	University of Oklahoma, 1950, Anthropology (General)

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

University of Kentucky:	Associate to Full Professor, Department of Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences, 1963-; Department of Behavioral Science, College of Medicine, 1965-
University of Nebraska:	Associate Professor, Anthropology, 1962-63
Rice University:	Visiting Professor, Anthropology and Sociology, 1962
University of Houston:	Instructor to Associate Professor, Anthropology and Sociology, 1956-62

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

Academic:

Chancellor	Lexington Campus, University of Kentucky, 1982-
Vice President	Academic Affairs, University of Kentucky, 1981-82
Dean	College of Arts and Sciences, University of Kentucky 1972-80
Chairman	Department of Anthropology, University of Kentucky, 1970-72

Research:

Deputy Director	Center for Developmental Change, University of Kentucky, 1966-1970
Acting Director	Center for Developmental Change, University of Kentucky, 1964-65

Foundation:

Trustee	Witter Bynner Foundation for Poetry, 1978-

ANTHROPOLOGY INTERESTS

Applied Anthropology
Culture Change (development and innovation)
Intervention Models
Complex Organizations
Community Study
Race and Ethnic Interaction

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Development, education, and youth culture in peasant Ireland, 1971-72

Culture change in peasant Ireland, County Clare revisited, 1965-66; 1971-72

Occupational opportunities for Blacks in Houston, 1961-62

Sociocultural change in marginal income, family farm region, Plainville revisited, 1954-

Personal contact and ethnic attitudes, Tucson, 1954

(Field Assistant) Ethnic Health Survey Project (Papago, Pima, and Apache reservations), Arizona, 1953

Resistance to ethnic assimilation and ethnic identification, Seminole Freedmen, 1952

Ethnological Survey, Seminole Freedmen of Oklahoma, 1950-51

CONSULTING EXPERIENCE IN APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY
(representative)

Culture Change Community and Regional Development:	U.S. Agency for International Development U.S. Department of Commerce U.S. Office of Education, Division of Manpower Develop. Ireland Agricultural Research Institute Board of Methodist Missions University Council for Educational Administration
Change Agent Intervention Models:	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service U.S. Peace Corps, India Division Ireland Department of Agriculture, Advisory Service Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administrat New Orleans Diocesian Schools British Columbia District Superintendents Workshop on Educational Change

continued

Race and Ethnic Relations:	American Federation of Labor, Houston Houston Black Caucus Southern Regional Council, Atlanta Houston Council on Human Relations Various Houston Industry clients Dallas Public School System
Academic Program Design (Applied Anthropology) most recent:	Cleveland State University Memphis State University North Texas State University University of South Florida

AWARDS AND HONORS

Wenner-Gren Foundation	Pre-doctoral fellowship, 1955-56
National Science Fdnt.	Grant-in-aid for Research, 1965-66
Univ. of Kentucky	Research fellowship, 1964-65
Alpha Kappa Delta	Sociology Honorary
Phi Delta Kappa	Education Honorary
Omicron Delta Kappa	Educational Service Honorary

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND OFFICES

Society for Applied Anthropology (fellow)	President, 1977-78 Treasurer, 1971-74 Secretary-treasurer, 1966-71
American Anthropological Assoc. (fellow)	Executive Board, 1980-83
American Ethnological Society	Councillor, 1969-72

Society for Medical Anthro.
Council on Anthropology and Education
Southern Anthro. Society

PUBLICATIONS

Books:

The Dying Community (with Harland Padfield, eds), University of New Mexico Press, 1980.

Perspectives in Developmental Change, ed., University of Kentucky Press, 1968.

Plainville Fifteen Years Later, Columbia University Press, 1961.

(In Process) The Ethnographer in His/Her Own Society (with Albert Bacdayan, eds);

(In Process) Developmental Change in a Peasant Society: Western Ireland;

(In Process) Youth in a Peasant Society (with Carol Bryant)

Other:

1980 "Schizophrenia Irish Style," review essay in Reviews in Anthropology, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 155-163, 1980.

1980 "Foreword" to Local Success and Federal Failure, Charles Clinton, Abt Books, Cambridge, vii-viii.

1980 "Dependence on External Authority and Decline of Community," in Gallaher and Padfield (eds), The Dying Community, University of New Mexico Press, 1980.

1980 "Theory of the Dying Community," (with H. Padfield) in The Dying Community, Gallaher and Padfield, eds., University of New Mexico Press, 1980.

1980 "Predicting Culture Change in the Restudy Situation: Ireland," in S. Abbott and J. van Willigen (eds), Predicting Sociocultural Change, University of Georgia Press.

1978 Review of Immigrants in the Ozarks, in American Anthropologist, Vol. 80, No. 2, pp. 426.

1977 Review of Do Applied Anthropologists Apply Anthropology, in American Anthropologist, Vol. 79, No. 1, pp. 143-144.

1973 "Intervention: Changing the System," section editor, and "On Changing the System," in To See Ourselves, Thomas Weaver (ed), Scott, Foresman, pp. 433-478.

1973 Review of Education and Change in a Village Community, in American Anthropologist, Vol. 75, No. 2, pp. 463.

1973 "The View from Anthropology: A Perspective on Culture," in The Preparation of Educational Administrators: Social Science Perspectives, J. Culbertson, R. Farquhar, B. Fogarty, and M. Shibles (eds), Merrill Publishing Co., pp. 117-138.

1972 Review of Peasants, Power and Applied Social Change, in Human Organization, Vol. 31, No. 4.

1971 Comment on Rodolfo Stavenhagen's "Decolonializing Applied Social Sciences;" Human Organization, Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 349-50.

1971 "Implementation of Findings," in Evaluating MDTA Programs: F. McKinney and A. Mannenbach (eds), College of Education, University of Kentucky, pp. 297-309.

1968 "The Change Agent and Planned Change in the School System," Change and Innovation, Faculty of Education, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., pp. 30-40.

1968 "The Social Sciences and Developmental Change," Perspectives in Developmental Change, A. Gallaher (ed), University of Kentucky Press, pp. 1-16.

1967 "The Extension Agent as Analyst," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol.5, No.4, pp. 214-222.

1967 "Perspectives on Extension Agent Roles," (with F. Santopolo), Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 223-230.

1967 "The Little Community in the United States: A Combination of Opposites," in Change in the Small Community, W. J. Gore and L. C. Hodapp (eds), Friendship Press, pp. 105-123.

1967 "The Community in Southern Appalachia," The Public University in Its Second Century, Lloyd Davis (ed), University of West Virginia Public Affairs Series, No. 5, pp. 17-32. REPRINTED in Appalachia: Its People, Heritage, and Problems, Frank Riddell (ed.), Kendall-Hunt, pp. 291-304.

1966 Review of Manual for Kinship Analysis, in Science, 1966.

1966 "The Role of the Advocate in Directed Change," in Media and Educational Innovation, W. Meierhenry (ed), University of Nebraska Press, pp. 23-50.

1965 "Directed Change in Formal Organizations: The School System," in Change Processes in the Public Schools, CASEA, University of Oregon, pp. 37-55. REPRINTED in Cultural Relevance and Educational Issues, Francis Ianni and Ed. Storey (eds), Little Brown. Other reprintings.

1964 "Plainville: The Twice-Studied Town," in Vidich, Bensman, and Stein (eds), Reflections on Community Studies, Wiley and Sons, pp. 285-304.

1963 "Urbanizing Influences on Plainville," in P. Olson (ed), America as a Mass Society, Free Press, pp. 187-204.

1962 Review of The Children of Sanchez, In Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 43, No. 2.

1956 "Social Contact and Minority Attitudes," (with R. Mulligan), Alpha Kappa Deltan. Vp;/ XXVII, pp. 30-42.

1951 "The Goodman I Site, Custer Co., Oklahoma," Texas Archaeological and Paleontological Society, Vol. 22, pp. 188-216.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Lester D. Stephens

Born February 18, 1933; two children; m. Marie Ellis

B.S., University of Corpus Christi, 1954; M.Ed., University of Texas, 1959; Ph.D., University of Miami, 1964

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

Professor of History, 1978- , Graduate Faculty, 1970- , Honors Faculty, 1969- ; University of Georgia
Associate Professor of History, 1970-78; University of Georgia
Associate Professor of Education & History (joint appointments), 1967-70; University of Georgia
Assistant - Associate Professor of Social Studies Education, 1963-67; University of Georgia
Graduate assistant & temporary instructor, 1961-62; University of Miami
Assistant Professor of History & Registrar, 1957-61; University of Corpus Christi
Secondary school history teacher, 1954-57; Corpus Christi, Texas

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE: University of Georgia--Head of History Department, July 1981- ; Acting Head, January-June 1981; Coordinator of Instruction, 1979-81; Coordinator of Graduate History Teaching Fellows Program, 1969-77; Acting Graduate History Coordinator, Spring, 1977; Director, NDEA Summer Institutes, 1967 and 1968; Assistant Coordinator, Student Teaching Program, 1963-1965. University of Miami--Administrative Assistant, Cuban Refugee Teacher Training Program, 1963. University of Corpus Christi--College Registrar, 1957-61.

PUBLICATIONS:

Books

1. Joseph LeConte: Gentle Prophet of Evolution. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, Southern Biography Series, 1982, 340 pp.

2. Historiography: A Bibliography. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1975, 271 pp.

3. Probing the Past: A Guide to the Study and Teaching of History. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974, 307 pp. (4th printing). Two sections reprinted in The Vital Past: Writings on the Uses of History, ed. Stephen Vaughn. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985.

4. Developing Competency in Teaching Secondary Social Studies. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1974, 268 pp. Co-author with W. C. Merwin & D. O. Schneider.

5. Public School Business Administration and Finance. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, 1967, 378 pp. Co-author with O. Jarvis & H. Gentry.

Articles

1. "The Mermaid Hoax: Indications of Scientific Thought in Charleston, S.C., in the 1840s," Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association, 1983, (1984), pp. 45-55.

2. "John R. Cotting," "Farish C. Furman," "William Louis Jones," "Joseph LeConte," and "Louis LeConte," in Dictionary of Georgia Biography, ed. Kenneth Coleman and Charles Stephen Gurr (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1983), pp. 219-21, 330-32, 559-61, 609-11, and 611-12, respectively.

3. "History as General Education: The University's Role," Proceedings and Papers of the Georgia Association of Historians, 1982, pp. 69-72.

4. "Forget Their Color: J. Peter Lesley on Slavery and the South," New England Quarterly, 53 (June, 1980), 212-21.

5. "Joseph LeConte and the Development of the Physiology and Psychology of Vision in the United States," Annals of Science, 37 (May, 1980), 303-21.

6. "Farish Carter Furman," and "The LeConte Family," in The Encyclopedia of Southern History (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1979), 499-500, 711.

7. "Birdflight and Aviation: An Unheralded View," American Aviation Historical Society Journal, 23 (Winter 1978), 267-71.

8. "A Righteous Aim: Emma LeConte Furman's 1918 Diary," Georgia Historical Quarterly, 62 (Fall 1978), 213-24.

9. "Joseph LeConte's Evolutional Idealism," Journal of the History of Ideas, 39 (July-September, 1978), 465-80.

10. "The Appointment of the Commissioner of Agriculture in 1877: A Case Study in Political Ambition and Patronage," Southern Quarterly, 15 (July, 1977), 371-86.

11. "Joseph LeConte's Contribution to American Ornithology," Georgia Journal of Science, 35 (June, 1977), 170-81.

12. "From History to Social Studies," AHA Newsletter, 15 (April, 1977), 9-11.

13. "Evolution and Woman's Rights in the 1890s: The Views of Joseph LeConte," The Historian, 38 (February, 1976), 239-52.

14. "Joseph LeConte on Evolution, Education, and the Structure of Knowledge," Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 12 (April, 1976), 103-19.

15. "Musty Pages and Hoary Sages: Procedures for Investigating Local History," in Crackers and Red Suspenders: Teaching Local History and Government in Georgia, ed. T. Northup and N. Crawley, Atlanta: Georgia Council for the Social Sciences, 1976, 5-16.

16. "Farish Furman's Formula: Scientific Farming in the 'New South,'" Agricultural History, 50 (April, 1976), 377-90.

17. "A Former Slave and the Georgia Convict Lease System," Negro History Bulletin, 39 (January, 1976), 505-507.

18. "Of Mercury, Moses, and Medicine: Views of Dr. John M. B. Harden," Georgia Historical Quarterly, 59 (Winter 1975), 402-15.

19. "The Fraudulent Fountain," Research Studies (Washington State University), 43 (March, 1975), 51-54.

20. "Proteus at Play with the Past: Historical Versus Mythical Thinking," The History Teacher, 8 (May 1975), 410-23.

21. "From Product to Process: Changing Focus in the Teaching of History," Georgia Social Science Bulletin, 1 (Fall, 1968), 29-36.

22. "The Effects of Class Size and Instructional Method on Attitudes Toward the Teaching Profession," Contemporary Education, 40 (November, 1968), 76-78. Co-author with C. Berryman.

23. "The Mythopoeic Role of the Teacher," Teachers College Record, 68 (May, 1967), 607-13.

24. "Essential Teaching Aids for the Social Studies Classroom," Journal of Secondary Education, 41 (May, 1966), 214-20. Co-author with O. Jarvis.

25. "Changes in Consistency of Educational Ideas," Journal of Teacher Education, 16 (September, 1965), 319-23. Co-author with G. Newsome & H. Gentry.

Accepted for Publication

1. "Joseph LeConte," in Keir B. Sterling, ed., Biographical Dictionary of North American Environmentalists. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

2. "John and Joseph LeConte," in William Ferris and Charles Wilson, eds., Encyclopedia of Southern Culture. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

3. "Scientific Societies in the Old South," in Ronald L. Numbers and Todd Savitt, eds., Science and Medicine in the Old South. (in press; LSU Press; due in 1988)

4. Francis S. Holmes, Curator of the Charleston Museum and Paleontologist in the Old South, (in press; The Charleston Museum; due in 1987; monograph)

WORK IN PROGRESS:

1. "Lewis R. Gibbes: Scientist in the Old South"

2. "John McCrady and the Intermixing of Science, Religion, and Culture"

3. A book-length study of the antebellum Charleston naturalists and their community, 1820-1880

4. A biography of John Bachman

PAPERS PRESENTED:

1. "Natural History Collecting in Antebellum Charleston, S.C.: The Golden Age," Society for the History of Natural History, October 24, 1986.

2. "From Travail to Triumph: The LeContes of Liberty County," Coastal Georgia Historical Society, Sea Island, Ga., January 26, 1986.

3. "John LeConte: Physicist in the Old South," Southeastern Section of the American Physical Society, Athens, Georgia, December 2, 1985.

4. "The LeContes of Liberty County, Georgia," LeConte-Woodmanston Seminar, Hinesville, Georgia, September 11, 1985.

5. "Joseph LeConte and the Development of Physiological Optics in the United States," Southeastern Section of the American Physical Society, Columbia, S.C., November 3, 1983.

6. "Views on Historical Interpretation and Historical Thinking and Their Import for Teaching," Center for History Teaching, Pan American University, Edinburg, Texas, June 6, 1983.

7. "The Mermaid Hoax: Indications of Scientific Thought in Charleston, S.C., in the 1840s," South Carolina Historical Association, Newberry, S.C., April 9, 1983.

8. "The Views of Sir Charles Lyell on Life in the Southeastern Coastal Region," Symposium on Life in Coastal Georgia, Brunswick, Georgia, April 26, 1983.
9. "Joseph LeConte," University of Georgia Alumni Association Dinner for Retired Faculty and Staff, April 22, 1982.
10. "History and General Education: The University's Role," Georgia Association of Historians, Augusta, Georgia, May 1, 1982.
11. "Scientific Societies in the Old South," Symposium on Science in the Old South, under the auspices of the Center for the Study of Southern Culture, The University of Mississippi, March 26, 1982.
12. "Joseph LeConte: The Image and the Man," Society of American Archivists, Berkeley, California, September 3, 1981.
13. "Joseph LeConte's Theory of Mountain Formation," Physics and Geology Departments, University of South Carolina, Columbus, S.C., October 16, 1981.
14. "Joseph LeConte as Scientist and Teacher," South Carolina Science Council, Columbia, S.C., October 16, 1981.
15. "Lewis R. Gibbes and Scientific Activity in Charleston," The Citadel Conference on the South, April 23-25, 1981.
16. "Lewis R. Gibbes and the Professionalization of Science in Antebellum South Carolina," Southern Historical Association, Atlanta, Georgia, November 13, 1980.
17. "Joseph LeConte, Scientist," Georgia Author's Club, Athens, Georgia, October 18, 1979.
18. "The Legacy of the LeContes," Seminar on the LeConte-Woodmanston Project, Hinesville, Georgia, March 1, 1978.
19. "Joseph LeConte: A Biographical Sketch," Phi Alpha Theta, Athens, Georgia, January 27, 1977.
20. "Fundamental Considerations in Teaching Secondary School History," Georgia Association of Historians, 1977 Annual Meeting, Athens, Georgia, April 2, 1977.

ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS:

Invited participant in Symposium, and Chief Evaluator of, the GEH-funded Project on "History in the Secondary-School Curriculum," Georgia State University, October 6, 1984. Drafted recommendations, which were published in History in Georgia Schools, January, 1985.

Chairman, Panel on Ernest E. Just as Scientist and Teacher, E.E. Just Commemorative Symposium, South Carolina State University, Orangeburg, S.C., October 21, 1983.

Senior Judge and Spokesman, District History Day, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986.

Referee for manuscripts submitted to the Georgia Historical Quarterly, The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society, Random House, Inc., The University of Georgia Press, University of Alabama Press, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Harper & Row, Inc.

Referee of proposals submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, and the Wilson Center of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Guggenheim Foundation.

Commentator, papers on science in the antebellum South, Georgia Studies Symposium, Atlanta, Georgia, February 15, 1980.
Report on 1978 AHA Session on "Area Studies," Network News Exchange (The Society for History Education), 4, No. 3, p. 8.

Participant, Third Newberry Library Conference on Teaching State and Local History, March 21-26, 1979.

Invited participant in Conference on Teaching, Department of History, Princeton University, March 31, 1978.

Service Award, Regional Social Science Fair, 1971; judge of social science fairs, 1967-1972.

Consultant, history programs in 14 high schools and 10 junior colleges, colleges, and universities, 1964-87.

Director, NDEA Summer Institute for Advanced Study in Historical Processes and Teaching Strategies, University of Georgia, 1968.

Co-director, NDEA Summer Institute for Advanced Study in U.S. History, University of Georgia, 1967.

PUBLISHED REVIEWS OF BOOKS

1. A Yankee Botanist in the Carolinas: The Reverend Moses Ashley Curtis, D.D. (1808-1872). In North Carolina Historical Review (in press).

2. American Science in the Age of Jefferson, by John C. Greene. In Georgia Historical Quarterly, 70 (Winter, 1986), 762-64.

3. The Writing of American History. Rev. ed., by Michael Kraus and Davis D. Joyce. In Journal of Southern History, 52 (November, 1986), 611-12.

4. Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern, by Ernst Breisach. In American Historical Review, 89 (October, 1984), 1038.

5. Black Apollo of Science: The Life of Ernest E. Just, by Kenneth R. Manning. In Georgia Historical Quarterly, 68 (Spring, 1984), 119-21.

6. Nearby History, by David E. Kyvig and Myron A. Marty. In The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society, (Autumn, 1983), 435-36.

7. The Geological Sciences in the Antebellum South, ed. by James X. Corgan. In Journal of Southern History, 49 (February, 1983), 122-24.

8. Using Local History in the Classroom, by Fay D. Metcalf and Matthew T. Downey. In The History Teacher, 16 (November, 1982), 152-53.

9. The Past and the Present, by Lawrence Stone; Perspectives on History, by William Dray; The Mind and Method of the Historian, by Emmanuel LeRoy Ladurie. In The History Teacher, 16 (November, 1982), 125-27.

10. The Origins of History, by Herbert Butterfield. In American Historical Review, 87 (October, 1982), 1041.

11. Career Opportunities for Historians, by Lee Ann Smith, et al. In Georgia Historical Quarterly, 66 (Spring, 1982), 97-98.

12. Practicing History, by Barbara Tuchman. In Georgia Historical Quarterly, 66 (Summer, 1982), 278-79.

13. Recycling the Past, ed. by Leila Zenderland. In The Historian, 41 (May, 1979), 583-84.

14. Understanding History through the American Experience by Charles Poinsatte and Bernard Norling; and Speculations on American History, by Morton Borden and Otis L. Graham. In The History Teacher, 9 (May, 1978), 442-43.

15. Total Revolution: A Comparative Study of Germany under Hitler, the Soviet Union under Stalin, and China under Mao, by C. W. Casinelli. In The History Teacher, 11 (November, 1977), 130-31.

16. Teacher Education in the United States by the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education. In The History Teacher, 10 (May, 1977), 484-85.

17. Teaching American History, edited by Glen Linden and Mathew T. Downey. In The History Teacher, 10 (May, 1977), 486-87.

18. After Everything: Western Intellectual History Since 1945 by Roland N. Stromberg. In The History Teacher, 9 (August, 1976), 672-73.

19. The Drama of History by John Fines and Raymond Verrier. In The History Teacher, 9 (May, 1976), 504-05.

20. Joseph Jones, M.D.: Scientist of the Old South by James O. Breeden. In Georgia Historical Quarterly, 59 (Winter 1976), 467-68.

21. The Relevance of History by Gordon Connell-Smith and Howell A. Lloyd. In The History Teacher, 7 (February 1974), 304-05.

22. History: An Introduction for the Intending Student by Harold Perkin. In Social Studies, 63 (October 1972), 234.

23. The Death of the Past by J. H. Plumb. In Social Education, 34 (December 1971), 937-39.

24. History and the Social Sciences by Mark Krug. In Social Education, 32 (January 1968), 81-83.

25. Education as a Discipline by Marc Belth. In Phi Delta Kappan, 67 (October 1965), 50-51.

PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION:

Outstanding Honors Professor Awards, 1971, 1974, 1976, 1978, 1980

Joseph E. Parks Award for Excellence in the Teaching of History, 1972
Pro Optime Perdocendo Honoratus Medal (Awarded by Honors Program, 1983)

General Sandy Beaver Special Award for Excellence in Teaching in the Division of Social Sciences of the College of Arts and Sciences, 1979 ($2,000 award)

President, Georgia Association of Historians, 1974-75

American Philosophical Society Grants for research on biography of Joseph LeConte, 1974, and for research on Joseph LeConte's contribution to geology, 1977

National Advisory Board, The History Teacher (1975-)

National Consultant, Center for the Study of Southern Culture, University of Mississippi (1981-)

Recipient of the first LeConte Medallion for publication on South Carolina scientists. Presented by the South Carolina Science Council, October 16, 1981

Recipient of University of Georgia Medal for Creativity in Research, March 29, 1984

Member of Editorial Board, University of Georgia Press (1982-86)

General Editor, History of American Science and Technology Series, University of Alabama Press (1983-)

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:

Member of American Historical Association, Society for History Education, Organization of American Historians, Southern Historical Association, Georgia Historical Society, Georgia Association of Historians, History of Science Society; Honor societies: Phi Alpha Theta, Phi Delta Kappa, Phi Theta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES:

A. Professional
   1. American Historical Association, Local Arrangements Committee, 1975 Convention, Atlanta, Georgia
   2. Board of Visitors, Georgia College, Milledgeville, Georgia (1975-78)
   3. Georgia Association of Historians, Membership Committee (1978-79).

B. University
   1. University Council (1968-71)
   2. Admissions Committee (1970-73)
   3. Self-Study Committee on the University Libraries (1979)
   4. Committee on Instructional Evaluation (1980)
   5. Chairman, Russell Foundation Lectureship Committee (1981-)
   6. University Representative to the Richard B. Russell Foundation (1985-)
   7. Bicentennial Committee on Events of Scholarship (1983-85)
   8. Search Committee, Dean of Education (1983)
   9. Graduate School Representative to University Council (1983-)
   10. University Curriculum Committee (1983-)
   11. Search Committee for Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (1985)
   12. Graduate School Committee on the Use of the GRE Analytical Score (1986)

C. College of Arts and Sciences
   1. Committee on Program for Superior Students (1968-69)
   2. Committee for Study of Master of Arts in Teaching Program (1970-73)
   3. Chairman, Search Committee for Head of Department of Philosophy, (1978-79)
   4. Committee on Selection of Recipients for the General Sandy Beaver Award for Excellence in Teaching, (1979-80)

5. Screening Committee, Graduate Faculty Appointments, Social Sciences, (1980-81)
6. Dean's Executive Committee (1984-85)

D. History Department
1. Self-Study Committee (for Southern Association of Colleges and Schools), chairman (1969-70)
2. Committee on Criteria for Promotion and Retention (1970-71)
3. Faculty Advisory Committee (1971-72)
4. Graduate Studies Committee (1969-78), ex officio (1978-80)
5. Teaching Assistants Supervisory Committee, chairman (1969-77)
6. Committee on Selection of Textbooks for Survey Courses, chairman (1970, 1972, 1974)
7. Committee on Joint Program with Department of Social Science Education (1971-72)
8. Committee on Evaluation of Instruction, chairman (1970-77)
9. Committee for the Study of Graduate Programs in History (1972-73)
10. Faculty Search Committees (1978, 1980, 1982, 1986)
11. Undergraduate Studies Committee, ex officio (1978-80)

E. Dissertations and Theses (1969-).
1. Director of 4 doctoral dissertations, two masters' theses, one honors thesis
2. Member of 8 doctoral advisory committees
3. Member of reading committee for 21 doctoral dissertations, 8 M.A. theses, one honors thesis

VITA

Russell R. Dynes

Present Position:

Professor and Chair, Department of Sociology, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware 19716

Academic Degrees:

A.B., The University of Tennessee, 1948
M.A., The University of Tennessee, 1950
Ph.D., The Ohio State University, 1954

Academic Positions:

Graduate Assistant and Instructor, The University of Tennessee, 1948-50.
Graduate Assistant, Assistant Instructor, The Ohio State University, 1951-52.
Instructor, The Ohio State University, 1952-56.
Assistant Professor, The Ohio State University, 1956-60.
Visiting Professor, Capital University, Summer, 1958.
Associate Professor, The Ohio State University, 1960-65.
Fulbright Professor, Ain Shams University and Arab States Center for Education in Community Development, Egypt, 1964-65.
Professor, The Ohio State University, 1965-77.
Fulbright Professor, Center for Advanced Study in Sociology, University of Delhi, December 1971-1972.
Professor, University of Delaware, 1982-
Visiting Professor, University College, Cardiff, February-June, 1985.

Administrative Positions:

Co-Director, Disaster Research Center, The Ohio State University, 1964-77, University of Delaware, 1984-
Chair, Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, 1974-77.
Executive Officer, American Sociological Association, 1977-1982.
Chair, Department of Sociology, University of Delaware, 1982-

Awards and Honors:

Fulbright Award, Senior Lecturer, United Arab Republic, 1964-65.
Graduate Teaching Award, Alpha Kappa Delta, 1969.
Fulbright Award, Senior Lecturer, India, 1971-72
Honorary Faculty Membership, Civil Defense Preparedness Agency Staff College, 1973.
Honorary Lifetime Faculty Award, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency Staff College, 1974.
Phi Kappa Phi, 1976, Sigma Xi, 1983.
Honorary Member, International Disaster Institute, London.
Award for Distinguished Professional Service, North Central Sociological Association, 1982.

Research Experience:

Project Director, Cooperative Study Between The University of Tennessee and the Tennessee Department of Welfare, 1949-50.

Co-Director, Study of Industrial Migrants in the Ohio Atomic Area, sponsored by the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, 1954-55.

Project Director, "Educational Changes in a Transitional Community," School Community Development Study, sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation, The Ohio State University, 1955-56.

Research Associate, "Relationship Between Sociological Background Factors and the Psychiatric Fitness of Air Force Personnel," School of Aviation Medicine, Air University, Randolph Field, Texas, 1953-57.

Project Supervisor, Wellsville Project, Community and Regional Planning and Development, Engineering Experiment Station, The Ohio State University, 1957-59.

Faculty Supervisor, Social Science Research Council Undergraduate Research Stipend, 1956.

Supervisor, Several Projects sponsored by the Graduate School of The Ohio State University, 1955-60.

Co-Principal Investigator, "Laboratory simulation Studies of Organizational Behavior Under Stress," The Ohio State University Research Foundation, sponsored by the Office of Aerospace Research, Air Force, 1963-69.

Fellow, American Research Center in Egypt, 1965-66.

Principal Investigator, "Community Reaction to Water Resource Problems in Relation to Planning," Office of Water Resources Research, Department of Interior, 1967-71.

Principal Investigator, "Restudy of a Transitional Community." College of Commerce and Administration Grant, 1966-68.

Co-Principal Investigator, "Cross Cultural Studies of Disaster," Mershon Social Science Foundation, 1968-71.

Co-Principal Investigator, "Organizational Response to Major Community Crises," National Institute of Mental Health, 1968-74.

Co-Principal Investigator, "Police Behavior in a College Riot," Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1970-71.

Research Experience, (continued):

Co-Principal Investigator, "Delivery of Mental Health Services in the Xenia Disaster," State of Ohio Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, 1974-75.

Co-Principal Investigator, "Organizational Communication and Decision Making in Disaster," Advanced Projects Research Agency, 1974-75.

Co-Principal Investigator, "Delivery of Emergency Medical Services in Disaster," Bureau of Health Services Research, Health Resources Administration, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975-77.

Co-Principal Investigator, "Delivery of Mental Health Services in Disaster," National Institute of Mental Health, 1976-79.

Co-Principal Investigator, "Development of Baseline Information of Mental Health Disaster Assistance/Crises Intervention Needs and Resources," National Institute of Mental Health, 1976-77.

Principal Investigator, Various Projects related to the Activities of the American Sociological Association, NSF, NIE, FIPSE, Lilly, 1977-82.

Co-Principal Investigator, Mass Media and Disaster, National Science Foundation, 1985-87.

Co-Principal Investigator, Local Emergency Management Agencies, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 1985-

Principal Investigator, "The Organizational Response to the 19 September 1985 Mexico City Earthquake, National Science Foundation, 1986-87.

Conference and Workshop Participation

Guest Lecturer and Consultant, Critical Social Problems of Today, Auburn University, 1956.

Participant, Conference on Social Theory, Emory University, 1956.

Participant, Seminar on "Interpretations of Religion in Sociological Theory," University of North Carolina, 1959.

Delegate, International Consultation on the Sociology of Religion, Georgetown University, September, 1962.

Participant, Workshop on Crisis Research, Sponsored by the University of Pittsburgh and the System Development Corporation, Newport Beach, California, December, 1966.

Participant, Workshop on Sociological Aspects of Water Resources Research, Utah State University, May, 1968.

Conference and Workshop Participation, (continued):

Participant, Caribbean Regional Seminar on Pre-Disaster Preparedness, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, June, 1968.

Participant, Illeme Seminaire Sur La Planification Des Secours En Cas De Catastrophes Naturelles, Port-au-Prince, Haiti, June, 1970.

Faculty Member, Institute of Comparative Sociology, Seminar on Political Violence, University of Illinois, Urban, Illinois, July, 1970.

Participant, "Methodological Issues in Comparative Research," Institute of Comparative Sociology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, April, 1971.

Principal Lecturer, Seminar on the Sociological Aspects of Collective Stress, Sponsored by Patna University, A. N. Sinha Institute and the U.S. Educational Foundation in India. Bihar, India, March, 1972.

Participant, Seminar on Organizational and Community Responses to Disasters, Sponsored by National Science Foundation and Japan Society for Promotion of Science, Columbus, Ohio, September, 1972.

Participant, NIMH Continuing Education Seminar in Emergency Mental Health Services, Washington, DC, June 22-24, 1973.

Participant, Invitational Conference, "The Assessment of Social Impacts of Oil Spills, "The Institute on Man and Science, Rensselaerville, New York, September 25-28, 1973.

Participant, International Conference of Disaster Researchers, Sponsored by the Centre d'Etudes Psychosociologique des Sinistres et de leur Prevention, Paris, France, September 5-6, 1974.

Participant, Consultant, "Interorganizational and Interagency Relations in Major Disasters," National Emergency Planning Establishment, Government of Canada, Arnprior, Ontario, October 22-24, 1974.

Participant, Second National Conference on Reduction of Natural Hazards, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, June 22-25, 1975. Third National Conference, June 30-July 2, 1976.

Seminar Leader, "Civil Military Relations in Crises," Foreign Area Officers Course, Army Civil Affairs School, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, December 17-18, 1975.

Participant, First National Social Scientists Conference, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Memphis, Tennessee, September 20-24, 1976.

Participant, Workshop on Issues and Options in Disaster Management, Office of Technology Assessment, Washington, DC, March, 1978.

Participant, Workshop, Functions and Effects, Emergency Preparedness, National Governors Association, Washington, DC, May 25-26, 1978.

Conference and Workshop Participation (continued):

Participant, Workshop, Fire Safety and Disaster Preparation, Intergovernmental Science, Engineering and Technology Panel, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Arlington, Virginia, March, 1979.

Participant, Conference, Social and Economic Effects of Earthquakes and Planning to Mitigate Their Impacts, Yugoslav Association of Self-Managed Communities for the Interest for Scientific Research and U. S. National Science Foundation, Lake Bled, July, 1981.

Organizer, Workshop in Directions in Applied Sociology, American Sociological Association, Washington, DC, December, 1981.

Principal Speaker, Workshop on Contingency Planning in Transportation, Krannert School of Management, Purdue University, March, 1982.

Participant, Symposium on Disaster Assistance and Development, The Center for Global Policy Studies, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, November, 1982.

Participant, Program Planning Conference, Senior Executive Policy Center, National Emergency Training Center, Emmitsburg, MD, September ,1983.

Participant, Conference on Toward Disaster Theory, Senior Executive Policy Center, Emmitsburg, Maryland, August, 1984.

Participant, Conference on Role Conflict and Support for Emergency Workers, NIMH and FEMA, Washington, DC, December, 1984.

Organizer, National Workshop in Information and Data Computerization, University of Delaware, December, 1984.

Delegate, 4th World Congress of Emergency and Disaster Medicine, Brighton, England, June, 1985.

Participant, Interchange: Understanding Through International Exchange, Vienna Austria, April, 1985.

Participant, International Symposium on Housing and Urban Redevelopment after Natural Disaster. Mitigating Future Losses, Sponsored by American Bar Association, Bal Harbour, Florida, October, 1985.

Chair, Seminar for Federal Administrators and Personnel Officers, Sociologists Applying Research and Program Skills, American Sociological Association, Rockville, MD, March 20, 1986.

Presenter, Symposium on Social Structure and Disaster, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, May 15-16, 1986.

Presenter, Conference on Reconstruccion/Prevencion: Aspectos Psicosociales de la Catastrofe, Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, June 30-July 2, 1986.

Chair, The 40th Anniversary Fulbright Lecture, American Sociological Association, New York, Aug. 31, 1986.

Program Organizer, Section on Peace and War, American Sociological Association, New York, Sept. 3, 1986.

Chair, "Emergency Planning, American Nuclear Society, Bethesda, Md., Sept. 16, 1986.

Presenter, "The American Disaster Research Community, U.S. Italian Disaster Conference, Newark, De., October 20, 1986.

Chair, "American Religion", Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., Nov. 16, 1986.

Presenter, U.S. Mexico Workshop on the 1985 Mexico Earthquake, National Science Foundation, Mexico City, Nov. 17-19, 1986.

Lecturer on Emergency Planning. Asian Disaster Preparedness Center, Asian Institute on Technology, Bangkok, Thailand, Nov. 3-6, 1986.

Participant, Emergency Management Issues Seminar, National Emergency Training Seminar, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Emmitsburg, Md., January 7 to 9, 1987.

Lecturer:

National Center for Social and Criminological Research, Cairo, U.A.R.; American University in Cairo, UNESCO Arab States Center, Sirs-el-layyan, U.A.R.: Canadian Emergency Measures Organization, Arnprior, Ontario; Temple University Medical School MEND Symposium; Office of Civil Defense Staff College, Battle Creek, Michigan; National Association of State Defense Directors; Symposium on Law Enforcement Science and Technology; American Hospital Association; U.S. Department of State; Canadian Department of Health and Welfare; Centre d'Etudes Psychosociologique des Sinistres et de leur Prevention, Paris, France; School of Aviation Medicine, San Antonio, Texas; Institute of Disaster Preparedness, University of Southern California; Institute of Government, University of Georgia; Seminar on Church Response to U.S. Disasters and Emergencies, Church World Service, Pittsburgh and Denver; Region II, VIII, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, Olney, Maryland, Portland, Oregon; U.S. Civil Defense Council, Region I; Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency, Delaware Emergency Management Office; Oak Ridge National Laboratories; University of Michigan; University of Nebraska-Omaha; University of Akron; University of Delaware; Central States Faculty Conferences; Oberlin College, Purdue University, Danforth Conference, Lake Forest College; Auburn University; Kentucky Wesleyan University; University of Tennessee; University of Cincinnati; Kent State University; University of Toledo; Wooster College; Utah State University; Cornell University; Pennsylvania State University; Washington University at St. Louis; Air Force Academy; Denison University; University of Illinois; Ghandi Peace Foundation; Rajasthan University; Jawaharal Nehru University; Poona University; Mysore University; University of Kerala; Madras University; Osmania University; Panjab University; Tribhuvan University, Nepal; Government Men's College, Lahore, Pakistan; University of North Carolina-Greensboro; Old Dominion University; Wichita State University; U.P.I.; Texas Women's University, University of Glasgow, University of Exeter, Oxford Polytechnic, Middlesex Polytechnic, North Texas State University; University of Notre Dame; University of Tennessee-Martin.

Publications:

Books:

1964 Social Problems: Dissensus and Deviation in an Industrial Society. New York: Oxford University Press. 594 pp. (Co-author).

1969 Deviance: Studies in the Process of Stigmatization and Societal Reaction. New York: Oxford University Press. 575 pp. (Co-author).

1970 Organized Behavior in Disaster. Lexington: D. C. Heath. 236 pp. (Republished 1976)

1975 Social Movements, Violence and Change: The May Movement in Curacao. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 175 pp. (Co-author)

1975 Deviance: Definition, Management and Treatment. New York: Oxford University Press. 640 pp. (Co-author).

Books, (continued):

1982 Internos 1977-82, Washington: American Sociological Association. 48 pp.

1983 Applied Sociology, San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 490 pp. (Co-editor).

1986 Sociology of Disaster: The Contributions of Sociology to Disaster Research. Gorizia, Italy: ISIG/Franco Angeli (Co-editor).

1986 The Fulbright Experience: 1946-1986, New Brunswick: Transaction Books, (Co-editor).

Chapters, Monographs, and Reports:

1. 1951 Homes for the Homeless in Tennessee. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee. Publication of the Bureau of Sociological Research, The University of Tennessee Record Extension Series, Volume 27, No. 4, 67 pp. (with William E. Cole).

2. 1954 "The Urban Class System," and "The Urban Religions." Pp. 115-141 and 191-209 in William E. Cole (ed.), Dynamic Urban Sociology. Harrisburg: Stackpole Press.

3. 1955 Mobile Industrial Workers and the Church: A Study of People on the Move in Ohio's Atomic Area. National Council of Churches, Division of Home Missions. 31 pp.

4. 1956 Consequences of Population Mobility for School and Community Change. Columbus: School-Community Development Study, The Ohio State University. 132 pp.

5. 1957 Social Factors Related to Adaptability of Air Force Pilot Trainees. Columbus: Research Foundation, The Ohio State University. 176 pp. (with Alfred Clarke and John Cuber).

6. 1959 "The Relation of Community Characteristics to Religious Organization and Behavior." Pp. 253-268 in Marvin Sussman (ed.), Community Structure and Analysis. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

7. 1960 "The Inner City Church." Pp 15-18 in John Lane Williams (ed.), Our Mission to the City. Report of Methodist Inner City Conference.

8. 1964 "Some Preliminary Observations in Organizational Responses in the Emergency Period after the Niigata, Japan Earthquake of June 16, 1964." Research Report #11, Disaster Research Center, 49 pp. (with J. E. Haas and E. L. Quarantelli). (Republished in entirety in Japanese by Japanese Government).

9. 1964 "Some Preliminary Observations of the Response of Community Organizations Involved in the Emergency Period of the Alaskan Earthquake." Working Paper #2, Disaster Research Center, 28 pp. (with J. E. Haas and E. L. Quarantelli).

Chapters, Monographs, and Reports (continued):

10. 1966 Observations on Social Change. Sirs-el-layyan, UAR: Arab States Center for Education for Community Development. 44 pp. (in English and Arabic).

11. 1967 Acceptance of Change, Part I. Sirs-el-layyan, UAR: Arab States Center for Education for Community Development. 29 pp. (with Louis K. Meleika).

12. 1968 The Functioning of Established Organizations in Community Disasters. Report Series No. 1. Columbus: Disaster Research Center. 52 pp. (with George Warheit).

13. 1968 "Operational Problems of Organizations in Disasters." Pp. 151-176 in 1967 Emergency Operations Symposium. Santa Monica: System Development Corporation.

14. 1969 Community Priorities in the Anchorage, Alaska Earthquake, 1964. Monograph Series No. 4. Columbus: Disaster Research Center. 173 pp. (with Daniel Yutzy, major author, and William Anderson).

15. 1969 The Functioning of Expanding Organizations in Community Disasters. Report Series no. 2. Columbus: Disaster Research Center. 82 pp.

16. 1969 Organized Behavior in Disaster: Analysis and Conceptualization. Columbus: Disaster Research Center. 254 pp.

17. 1970 "Different Types of Organizations in Disaster Response and Their Operational Problems." In Robert Brictson (ed.), Emergency Operations. Los Angeles: Tinnon-Brown. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

18. 1970 Disruption on the Campuses of Ohio College and Universities, Spring, 1970. Report prepared for the Ohio Council of Churches and Ohio Board United Ministries in Higher Education. 119 pp. (with E. L. Quarantelli). (Several sections of this have been reprinted elsewhere.)

19. 1971 "Community Conflict: An Explanation of Its Absence in Natural Disaster." Pp. 220-234 in Clagett G. Smith (ed.), Conflict Resolution: Contributions of the Behavioral Sciences. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

20. 1971 Jan. Environment Crises. Columbus: Water Resources Center, The Ohio State University. 91 pp. (with Dennis Wenger).

21. 1971 Dec. A Model of Community Problem Solving and Selected Empirical Applications. Columbus: Water Resources Center, The Ohio State University. 153 pp. (with Dennis Wenger).

22. 1972 "Cross Cultural Perspective on Disaster." Pp. 235-257 in Proceedings of the Japan-United States Disaster Research Seminar: Organizational and Community Responses to Disaster. Columbus: Disaster Research Center.

Chapters, Monographs, and Reports (continued):

23. 1972 A Perspective on Disaster Planning. Report Series No. 11. Columbus: Disaster Research Center. 94 pp. (with E. L. Quarantelli and Gary Kreps).

24. 1972 "Police Department Planning for Civil Disturbances: Organizational Factors involved in Changes.: Pp. 76-88 in F. Adler and G. O. W. Mueller (eds.), Politics, Crime and the International Scene: An Inter-American Focus. Hato Rey, PR: North South Press. (with M. Brooks and E. L. Quarantelli).

25. 1972 May Police Perspectives and Behavior in a Campus Disturbance. Columbus: Disaster Research Center. 166 pp. (with E. L. Quarantelli and James L. Ross).

26. 1974 "Organizations as Victims in American Mass Racial Disturbances: A Reexamination." Pp. 121-142 in E. C. Vivano and Israel Drapkin (eds.), Victimology. Volume 4. Lexington: D. C. Heath. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

27. 1974 "Police Perspectives and Behavior in a Campus Disturbance." In Donal MacNamara and Marc Riedel (eds.), Police: Perspectives, Problems and Prospectives. New York: Praeger. (with E. L. Quarantelli and James L. Ross).

28. 1974 The Role of Local Civil Defense in Disaster Planning. Report Series No. 16. Columbus: Disaster Research Center. 105 pp. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

29. 1975 The Delivery of Mental Health Services in the Xenia Tornado. Columbus: Disaster Research Center. 280 pp. (with E. L. Quarantelli and others).

30. 1975 "Rapport sur les activities du Disaster Research Center." Pp. 23-44 in Les Comportements Associes Aux Catastrophes. (Table Ronde Du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique) Paris: Institut International du Feu. (in French and English). (with E. L. Quarantelli).

31. 1976 "Emergency Disaster Plans for Vocational Schools." Pp. 151-161 in Developing the Leadership Potential of Urban Vocational Education Administrators. 1976 National Leadership Seminar for Administrators of Vocational Education in April. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

32. 1976 "The Family and Community Context of Individual Reactions to Disaster." Pp. 231-245 in H. J. Parad, H. L. P. Resnick, and Libbie Parad (eds.), Emergency and Disaster Management. Bowie: Charles Press Publishers. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

33. 1976 May Organizational Communications and Decision Making in Crises. Columbus: Disaster Research center. 58 pp. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

Chapters, Monographs, and Reports (continued):

34. 1977 "Crises and Disaster Research." In Annual Review of Sociology. Volume 3. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews Inc. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

35. 1978 "Interorganizational Relations in Communities Under Stress." Pp. 50-64 in E. L. Quarantelli (ed.), Disasters: Theory and Research. London: Sage Studies in Sociology.

36. 1979 "Emergency Medical Services Delivery in Disasters," in R. Adams Cowley, Ed., Collected Papers in Emergency, Medical School, p. 56-58.

37. 1979 Report of the Emergency Preparedness and Response Task Force, Staff Report to the President's Commission on the Accident at Three Mile Island, Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 168 pp.

38. 1980 "Helping Behavior in Large Scale Disasters," in David Horton Smith and Jacqueline MacCauley (eds.), Participation in Social and Political Activities. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. pp. 339-54 (with E. L. Quarantelli).

39. 1980 "An Assessment of the Social Impact," in An Assessment of the Consequences and Preparations for a Catastrophic California Earthquake: Findings and Actions Taken, Washington, Federal Emergency Management Agency, pp. 35-36, November.

40. 1981 "The Contributions of the Social Sciences to the Evaluation of Emergency Preparedness and Response," in D. Sills, C. Wolff and E. Shelanski, (eds.) The Accident at Three Mile Island: The Human Dimension, Boulder, Westview Press, pp. 119-129.

41. 1981 "Biography of a Colleague," in R. Huff and I. Barak-Glantz (eds.) The Mad, The Bad and the Different, Lexington, Lexington Books (with Alfred Clarke). XIX-XXIV.

42. 1982 "Models of Emergency Planning: Contributions from the Social Sciences," in Barclay G. Jones and Mina Tomazevic (eds.) Social and Economic Aspects of Earthquakes, Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, Institute for Testing and Research in Materials and Structures, pp. 379-87.

43. 1983 "Perspectives on Applied Educational Programs," in Freeman et al, Applied Sociology, pp. 295-311 (with Irwin Deutscher).

44. 1984 "The Environment of Disaster," in Preparing for Disaster: A Conference on Emergency Planning for Disabled and Elderly Persons, Washington, Federal Emergency Management Agency, pp. 8-19 (with D. E. Wenger).

45. 1985 "Community Response to Disaster," in Barbara Sowder (ed.) Disaster and Mental Health: Selected Contemporary Perspectives, Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, pp. 158-68. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

Chapters, Monographs, and Reports (continued):

46. 1986 "Role Simplification in Disaster," in Role Stressors and Supports for Emergency Workers. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 23-37, DHHS Publications, No. 85-1408. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

47. 1986 "Introduction," in Dynes and Pelanda, The Sociology of Disaster.

48. 1986 "The Concept of Role in Disaster Research," in Dynes and Pelanda, The Sociology of Disaster.

49. 1986 "Strengthening Post Disaster Mitigation: A Sociological Perspective," in Proceedings of the International Symposium on Mitigating Future Losses, American Bar Association, (forthcoming).

50. 1987 "Future Needs in Disaster Research," in Gary Kreps (ed.) Social Structure and Disaster, (forthcoming).

Articles:

1. 1954 "Preference for Male and Female Children: Traditional or Affectional." Marriage and Family Living, 16:128-130 (May). (with Simon Dinitz and Alfred Clarke).

2. 1954 "Toward the Sociology of Religion." Sociology and Social Research 38:227-232.

3. 1955 "Church-Sect Typology and Socio-Economic Status." American Sociological Review, 20-555-560.

4. 1956 "Levels of Occupational Aspiration and Selected Aspects of Family Affection." American Sociological Review, 21:212-215.

5. 1956 "Sectarianism, Rurality and Migration." Rural Sociology, 21:25-28 (March).

6. 1957 "The Consequences of Sectarianism for Social Participation." Social Forces, 5:331-334.

7. 1957 "Correlates of Marital and Sex Roles." The Graduate School Record, The Ohio State University, 2:9-10 (December). (with Aflred Clarke and Simon Dinitz).

8. 1959 "Levels of Aspiration and Family Affection: Religious Preference as a Variable." The Ohio Journal of Sciences. 59:103 (March). (with Alfred Clarke and Simon Dinitz).

9. 1963 "Student, Faculty and the Nature of the University." Faculty Forum, Volume 25, May.

10. 1965 "The Religious Interpretation of Disaster." Topic, 10:34-48. (Fall). Washington, PA: Washington and Jefferson College (with Daniel Yutzy).

Articles, (continued):

11. 1965 "Three Ladies of Sirs-el-layyan." Viewpoints, Washington: Friends of the Middle East, Volume 5, No. 9 (November).

12. 1966 "Natural Disaster as a Social Science Field." National Review of the Social Sciences, 3:85-94. (also summary in Arabic).

13. 1966 "Theoretical Problems in Disaster Research." Bulletin of Business Research 41:7-9. (September).

14. 1967 "Administrative, Methodological and Theoretical Problems of Disaster Research." Indian Sociological Bulletin 4.4:215-227. (July). (with E. L. Quarantelli and J. E. Haas).

15. 1967 "Impact of Disaster on Community Life." EMO National Digest, 7:10-13. (April).

16. 1967 "Societal and Community Problems in Disaster. EMO National Digest, 7:16-18 (October).

17. 1968 "The Church in Higher Education." Leader, 10:1-6. (April).

18. 1968 "Collective Stress and Its Relation to Water Resource Planning." Proceeding of Workshop on Sociological Aspects of Water Resources Research, Utah State University.

19. 1968 "Group Behavior Under Stress: A Required Convergence of Organizational and Collective Behavior Perspectives." Sociology and Social Research, 52:416-429. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

20. 1968 "Looting in Civil Disorders: An Index of Social Change." The American Behavioral Scientist, Volume 2, March. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

21. 1968 "Looting in Civil Disturbances and Disasters." Transaction. 5:9-14 (May). (with E. L. Quarantelli).

22. 1968 "Redefinitions of Property Norms in Community Emergencies." International Journal of Legal Research, 3:100:112 (December).(with E. L. Quarantelli).

23. 1968 "A Sociologist Looks at Water Resources Research." Proceedings of the Water Resources Colloquium. Institute for Research on Land and Water Resources, Pennsylvania State University.

24. 1969 "Dissensus and Consensus in Community Emergencies: Patterns of Looting and Property Norms." IL Politico, Revista di Science Politiche 34:276-291. (with E. L. Quarantelli) (includes an Italian summary).

25. 1969 "Organizations in Disaster." EMO National Digest 9:12-13. (April-May). (with George Warheit).

Articles, (continued):

26. 1969 "Looting Patterns in Community Disasters and Disturbances." Proceedings of the Third National Symposium on Law Enforcement and Technology. Chicago: IIT Research Institute. pp. 323-327. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

27. 1970 "Editors' Introduction." American Behavioral Scientist, 13:325-330. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

28. 1970 "Organization as Victim in Mass Civil Disturbances." Issues in Criminology 5:181-193 (Summer). (with E. L. Quarantelli).

29. 1970 "Organizational Involvement and Changes in Community Structure in Disaster." American Behavioral Scientist 13:430-439.

30. 1970 "Property Norms and Looting: Their Patterns in Community Crises." Phylon 31:168:182 (Summer). (with E. L. Quarantelli).

31. 1971 "Factors in Community Perception of Water Resources Problems." Water Resources Bulletin 7:644-651. (with Dennis Wenger).

32. 1972 "The Principle of Least Interest, Dating Behavior and Family Integration Settings." Journal of Marriage and Family 34:269-272. (with K. Eslinger and Alfred C. Clarke).

33. 1972 "When Disaster Strikes (It Isn't Much Like What you've Heard About)." Psychology Today 5:66-70 (February). (with E. L. Quarantelli).

34. 1973 "Editors' Introduction." American Behavioral Scientist 16:305-311. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

35. 1973 "On Institutionalization of Sociology in the United States." Sociological Focus 6:1-26 (Summer).

36. 1973 "Organizational and Political Transformation of a Social Movement: A Study of the 30th of May Movement in Curacao." Social Forces 51:330-341. (with William Anderson).

37. 1973 "Postscripts to a Presidential Address." Footnotes 1:8 (November).

38. 1974 "Counterrioters in Urban Disturbances: Opponents or Supporters of the Status-Quo?," Society 11:50-55 (March-April).

39. 1974 "Police Perspectives and Behavior in a Campus Disturbance." Journal of Police Science and Administration 2:344-351. (with E. L. Quarantelli and James L. Ross).

40. 1974 "Sociology as a Religious Movement: Thoughts on its Institutionalization in the United States." The American Sociologist 9:167-176 (November).

Articles, (continued):

41. 1974 "The Sociology of Religion of Charles Glock: Review Essay." Journal of Scientific Study of Religion 12:466-469.

42. 1975 "The Comparative Study of Disaster: A Social Organizational Approach." Mass Emergencies 1:21-31.

43. 1976 "Civil Disturbances and Social Change: A Comparative Analysis of the United States and Curacao." Urban Affairs Quarterly, September, Vol. 12:37-56 (with William Anderson).

44. 1976 "Community Conflict: Its Presence and Absence in Natural Disaster Situations." Mass Emergencies 1:139-152. (with E. L. Quarantelli).

45. 1976 "The Impact of Devotionalism and Attendance on Ordinary and Emergency Helping Behavior." Journal of Scientific Study of Religion, 15:47-59 (March).

46. 1977 "A Background Note on the Preliminary Findings and Impressions of the DRC Studies." Mass Emergencies 2:147-150.

47. 1978 "Organizational Adaptation to Crises." Disasters, Volume 3, 71-74 March. London: International Disaster Institute. (with Benigno Aguirre).

48. 1978 "Participation of Sociologists in the Fulbright Program," Footnotes, November.

49. 1980 "Sociology in China: Its Restoration and Future Role," Footnotes, October.

50. 1981 "The View From Inside," The American Sociologist 16:97-101, May.

51. 1983 "The Presidential Commission on the Accident at Three Mile Island," American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 26:607-621, May/June.

52. 1983 "Principles and Problems of Emergency Planning," Energy, Vol. 8, No. 8-9, pp. 653-660.

53. 1984 "The Institutionalization of COSSA: An Innovative Response to Crises by American Social Science," Sociological Inquiry, Vol. 54, No. 2, Spring, pp. 211-29.

Shorter Comments

1982 "Comment on the Creation of a Public Interest Sociology," The American Sociologist, Vol. 17, No. 3, August, p. 134.

1983a "Thinking Out Loud," About Teaching, Center for Teaching Effectiveness, University of Delaware, No. 15, March, p. 2-3.

1983b "On International Disaster Assistance," in the International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters, Vol. 1.

Shorter Comments (continued):

1983c Love Canal: Science, Politics and People, (Review Essay) Society, Vol. 20, No. 6, September/October, 1983, pp. 84-85.

Reprints of Articles

1957 No. 3 in J. Milton Yinger. Religion, Society and the Individual. New York: Macmillan.

1962 No. 4 in John F. Cuber and Peggy Harroff. Readings in Sociology. New York: Appleton Century. And in Bartlett H. Strudley. Society and Self: A Reader in Social Psychology. New York: Free Press.

1963 No. 9 in Grappling With Ideas. Menominie: Stout State College.

1966 No. 14 in Roles des Agences Familiales Dans Les Disasters. Ottawa: Ministre de la Sante-nationale et du Bein-etre.

1967 No. 3 in Dwight Dean and Donald Valdes. Experiments in Sociology. New York: Appleton Century. And in Marvin Shaw and Jack Wright. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill.

1968 No. 4 in Robert Rankin and Ritchie Lowery. Sociology: A Science of Society. New York: Charles Scribners Sons.

1968 No. 20 in New Society (August 8th). And in Don Bowen and Louis Massotti. Riots and Rebellion. Beverly Hills: Sage. And in Survival, Volume 4, No. 6 (December).

1968 No. 21 in Current (August).

1969 No. 3 in John Robinson and Phillip Shaver. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute of Social Research.

1969 No. 20 in Simon Dinitz, et al. Deviance. New York: Oxford University Press.

1969 No. 21 in Rodney Allen and Charles Adair. Violence and Riots in Urban America. Columbus: Charles Jones.

1970 No. 17 in Faculty Forum (March). And in The Christian (April).

1970 No. 21 in James Short, Jr. Modern Criminals. Chicago: Aldine. And in Bobbs Merrill Reprint Studies in Black History, BC 72.

1971 No. 20 in Nils Bateman and David Petersen (eds.). Targets for Change: Perspectives on an Active Sociology. Waltham: Xerox.

1971 No. 21 in H. Taylor Buckner. Deviance: Reality and Change. New York: Random House.

Reprints of Articles (continued):

1971 No. 30 in James Geschwender. The Black Revolt. New York: Prentice-Hall.

1972 No. 4 in Robert Rankin and Ritchie Lowry. Sociology: Social Science and Social Concern. New York: Charles Scribners Sons. (also in paperback).

1972 No. 20 in A. Birenbaum and E. Sagarin. Social Problems: Private Troubles and Public Issues. New York: Scribners.

1972 No. 21 in James Conyers and Morris Medley. Sociology in the Seventies. New York: Wiley. And in Ralph Turner and Lewis Killian. Collective Behavior. New York: Prentice-Hall.

1972 No. 33 in Readers Digest (July).

1973 No. 28 in Walter Reckless. The Crime Problem. New York: Appleton Century.

1973 No. 33 in New Society (January 4th).

1973 No. 31 in Impact of Water Resources Development. New York: Environment Information Center.

1973 No. 32 in Women, A Random House Annual, 1972. New York: Random House.

1973 Pp. 4-10 of Social Problems in Clifford Bryan. Social Change, Conflict and Education: A Foundations Text and Reader. Columbus: Charles Merrill.

1973 No. 21 in James Short, Jr. (ed.), Law and Order: Modern Criminals. Transaction (2nd ed.).

1973 No. 21 in Peter Rossi (ed.), Ghetto Riots. Transaction (2nd ed.)

1974 No. 20 in Stuart Palmer (ed.), New Perspectives on Deviance. Chicago: Aldine.

1974 No. 28 in Emilio Vivano and Israel Drapkin (eds.), Victimology. Lexington: D. C. Heath.

1975 No. 30 in Simon Dinitz, et al. Deviance: Definition, Management, Treatment. New York: Oxford University Press.

1975 No. 37 in Volume in honor of....

1975 No. 33 published as "Wenn Die Katastrophe Kommt: Wie Sich Dann Wirklich Verhalten, Psychology Heute, June.

1980 No. 19 in M. D. Pugh, Collective Behavior: A Source Book. St. Paul: West Publishing Company.

Reprints of Articles (continued):

1982 No. 40 in Edward Tiryakian, The Phenomenon of Sociology. New York: Irvington Publishers.

1984 SC 1983b reprinted in Disaster Management, Vol. 4, 1-2, June.

Editing:

Editor, The Ohio Valley Sociologist, 1958-63.
Editor, Newsletter, Ohio Council of Family Relations, 1960-64.
Editor, Special Issue, "On the Sociology of Religion," Sociological Focus, Volume 2, No. 1, 1968. (Also Editor's Introduction, p. 102.)
Editor, Consultant on social problems concepts, Dictionary of Modern Sociology, Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1969, Thomas F. Hoult, ed.
Co-Editor, Special Issue, "Organizational and Group Responses to Community Disaster," American Behavioral Scientist, Volume 13, No. 3 (January-February), 1970.
Co-Editor, Special Issue, "Dynamics of Organizational Involvement and Change in Civil Disturbances," American Behavioral Scientist, Volume 16, No. 3 (January-February), 1973.
Associate Editor, Review of Religious Research, 1968-77.
Co-Editor, Disaster Research Center Series, 1964-77.
Editor, ASA Footnotes, 1977-82.
Reviewer for a number of journals ranging from Journal of Scientific Study of Religion to Science.
Editorial Board, University of Delaware Press. 1983-

Professional Societies:

American Sociological Association
- Chair, Ad hoc Committee advising on participation of sociologists in Fulbright-Hays Programs (in conjunction with the Committee on International Exchange of Persons), 1968.
- Member, Committee on the Development of World Sociology, two terms
- Co-Chair, Liaison with National and International Organization.
- Chair, Committee on Committees, 1975
  Elected, 1974.
- Member, Committee on Regional Affairs, 1974-77.
- Chair, Section on Peace and War, 1985-86.

Professional Societies (continued):

International Sociological Association
Participation at World Congress of Sociology in Evian, France, 1966; Varna, Bulgaria, 1970; Toronto, Canada, 1974; Uppsala, Sweden, 1978; Mexico City, 1982, New Delhi, 1986.

North Central Sociological Association
Program Chair, 1985; Vice-President, 1970-71; President-Elect, 1971-72; President 1972-73; Representative to American Sociological Association, 1974-76.

Religious Research Association
Program Chair, 1968; Associate Editor, 1968-77; Treasurer, 1984-87.

Society for the Scientific Study of Religion
Treasurer, Elected, 1976-79.

Member, Technical Program Committee, Topical Meeting. "Radiological Accidents--Perspectives and Emergency Planning," American Nuclear Society, 1986.

Presented papers and/or chaired sessions of various annual meetings of: American Sociological Association, International Sociological Association, Religious Research Association, Ohio Council on Family Relations, Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, American Society of Criminology, American Water Resources Association, Society for the Study of Social Problems, Southwestern Sociological Society, Pacific Sociological Society, Southern Sociological Society, International Congress of Learned Societies in the Field of Religion, North Central Sociological Association, Association for Policy Analysis and Management, American Nuclear Society.

Teaching Experience:

Undergraduate: Introductory Sociology, Social Problems, Family, Race and Ethnic Relations, Community, Stratification, Religious Institutions, American Society, Comparative Social Organization, Senior Seminar, Industrial Sociology, Methods.

Graduate: Structural Sociology, Seminar in Sociology of Religion, Seminar in Stratification, Qualitative Methods, Pro-Seminar, Applied Sociology, Advanced General Sociology.

Advising: Major Advisor for over 20 completed Ph.D.s.
Dissertation and General Examinations Committees in about 40 Ph.D.s.
Major Advisor for several M.A.s.
Major Advisor for several Undergraduate Honors Program and Theses.

Professionally Related Activity

University

Conference Committee of the Teaching Staff, The Ohio State University, 1959-64; Secretary, 1960-1961; Chairman, 1961-1962.
Elected Member of Faculty Council, The Ohio State University, 1963-1966.
Elected Board Member of American Association of University Professors, The Ohio State University, 1970-1971.
Alumni Advisory Board, The Ohio State University, 1978-1981.

National Educational and Social Science Activities

Member, Developmental Task Force, Social Science Committee University Council on Water Resources Research, 1970.
Executive Committee, Academic Freedom Clearinghouse, ACLU, New York.
Executive Committee, Council of Secretaries, American Council of Learned Societies, 1980-1982.
Executive Committee, National Humanities Alliance, 1981-1982.
Chair, Executive Committee, Consortium of Social Science Associations, 1981-1982.

National Policy Issues

National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council
Member, Advisory Committee on Emergency Housing, Building Research Advisory Board, 1972.
Chair, Committee on International Disaster Assistance, Commission on Sociotechnical Systems, 1976-1979.
Publications of the Committee:
The U.S. Government Foreign Disaster Assistance Program (Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1978, 168 pp.).
The Role of Technology in International Disaster Assistance (Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1978, 102 pp.).
Assessing International Disaster Needs, (Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1978).
Member, Panel on Human Factors Research Needs in Nuclear Regulatory Research, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council, 1986-
Liaison Member, International Disaster Assistance Panel, United Nations Association of the United States of America (for NAS/NRC), 1976.
Head, Task Force on Emergency Response and Preparedness, The President's Commission on the Accident at Three Mile Island, 1979.

Professionally Related Activities, (continued):

International Education and Exchange

Member, Sociology Advisory Committee, Committee on International Exchange of Persons (reviews awards under Fulbright-Hays Program), 1970.
Elected Board Member, Research Committee on Disasters, International Sociological Association.
Executive Committee, AAAS Consortium of Affiliates for International Programs, 1979-82.
Chair, NATO Fellowship Committee, Committee on International Exchange of Scholars, 1980.
Convener, Board of External Examiners, University of Madras, India, 1975.
Board of Adjudicators, Graduate School, University of Kerala, India, 1976.
Fulbright Alumni Association, Board of Directors, 1980-83: Executive Committee, 1983; President-elect, 1983-84, President, 1984-85.

Consulting

Government Agencies

Federal Disaster Assistance Administration, HUD, 1977-78
Federal Emergency Management Agency, 1980, Cuban Refugee Consolidation
Community Services Administration, 1978, Home Heating Emergencies
President's Reorganization Project, 1977-78, Federal Emergency and Response Study
Secretario de Gobernacion, Estados Unidos Mexicanos. Development of a National Civil Protection Plan, 1985-86.

Research Agencies

Stanford Research Institute, 1971, 1974-76 Technology Assessment of Earthquake Prediction
Joseph Coates Associates, Washington, Natural Hazards, 1981

Law Firms

Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, Washington, D.C.
Shea and Gould, New York, N.Y.
Hunton and Williams, Richmond, VA.

Educational Institutions - Academic and Departmental Reviews

Wooster College, Denison University, Cleveland State University, Virginia Commonwealth University, University of Texas-San Antonio, Kent State University, West Virginia University, Northern Kentucky University, Brooklyn College, Rutgers University, University of Tennessee.

Testimony Before Legislative and Investigative Bodies

U. S. Congress: House Public Works.
Senate Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology.
Senate Committee on Governmental Operations.
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.
President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research.
National Research Council Panel on Behavioral Sciences, Commission on Human Resources.

Personal and Professional Travel:

China, India, Burma, Japan, Australia, England, Belgium, Netherlands, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Austria, Yugoslavia, Italy, Spain, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Egypt, Greece, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, USSR, Canada, Trinidad, Barbados, Virgin Islands, Antigua, Puerto Rico, Iran, Iraq, Curacao, Jamaica, Haiti, Bulgaria, Turkey, Nepal, Pakistan, Mexico, Iceland, Ireland.

Personal:

Born:	October 2, 1923, Dundalk, Ontario, Canada
Military Service:	1380th Engineer Petroleum Distribution Company, China-Burma-India Theatre, 1942-46
Married:	Wife: Sue Four Sons: Russ, Patrick, Gregory, Jon
Social Security No:	408-30-1382
Home Address:	346 S. College Avenue, Newark, Delaware, 19711
Phone:	302-731-7625
Office Address:	322 Smith Hall, Department of Sociology, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716
Phone:	302-451-2581, 8233
Frequent Weekend address:	64 Driftway Road, Earleville, MD. 21919
Phone:	301-275-2783

APPENDIX B

LIST OF LOCAL CONSULTANTS

SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW
LOCAL CONSULTANTS

UNIV.	Anthropology	Sociology	History
UF	Thomas Greaves Dean, Behavioral and Administrative Studies Trinity University San Antonio, TX 78384	John Clark Dept. of Sociology Univ. of Minnesota Minneapolis, MN 55455	Emory Evans Dept. of History Univ. of Maryland College Park, MD 20742
FSU *	Dave Douglas Davis Assoc. Professor Archaeologist Dept. of Anthropology Tulane University New Orleans, LA	Arne Kalleberg Dept. of Sociology Hamilton Hall, 070A Univ. of North Carolina Chapel Hill, NC 27514	Austin Kerr Ohio State Univ. Dept. of History Columbus, OH 43210
FAMU	N/A	Anna Grant Professor of Sociology Morehouse College Atlanta, GA 30314	Roland Smith Assoc. Vice Pres. Office of the Pres. Univ. of Houston 4800 Calhoun Rd. Room 212 E. Cullen Houston, TX 77004
USF	N/A	Dr. J. David Knottnerus Dept. of Sociology University of Tampa 401 W. Kennedy Blvd. Tampa, FL 33606-1490	Dr. Richard Lowitt Chairman Dept. of History Iowa Street Ames, IO 50011-1202

* Demography

Basil Zimmer
Professor of Sociology
Brown University
19681 Summerline Road
Box 55
Ft. Myers, FL 33908

(Continued)

UNIV.	Anthropology	Sociology	History
FAU	Francis Johnston Chairman Professor Univ. of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA 19104-6398	Wayne Villemez, Chair Ph.D. Dept. of Sociology Louisiana State Univ. Baton Rouge, LA 70803	Blaine Brownell Dean Univ. of Alabama School Soc. and Behavioral Sci. Birmingham, AL 35294
UWF	Patty Jo Watson Prof. of Anthropology Washington University St. Louis, MO 63130	Peter Wayne Falkman Hamiline University St. Paul, MN 55104	Aubrey Land Univ. of Georgia 175 Homestead Dr. Athens, GA 30605
UCF	Joseph Whitecotton Dept. of Anthropology Univ. of Oklahoma Norman, Oklahoma 73019	Jack Fitzgerald Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology Knox College Galesburg, IL 61401	Joseph Frantz 622 E. Manor Dr. Corpus Christi, TX 78412
FIU	N/A	Charles Ragin, Chair Northwestern Univ. Sociology Department Evanston, IL 60201	Carl Prince Dept. of History New York Univ. 19 Univ. Place Room 542 New York, NY 10003
UNF	N/A	Charles C. Lemert Dean of Social Sci. Dept. of Sociology Wesleyan University Middletown, CT 06457	Michael Galgano Head, Dept. of History James Madison Univ. Harrisonburg, VA 22807

APPENDIX C

LIST OF UNIVERSITY COORDINATORS

UNIVERSITY COORDINATORS

SOCIAL SCIENCES

UF	Dr. Ronald Akers Professor Department of Sociology College of Liberal Arts & Sciences	SC 622-0251 904/392-0251
FSU	Dr. James Cobbe Associate Dean, Social Sciences Professor of Economic	SC 284-5470 904/644-5470
FAMU	Dr. Larry Rivers Chairman Department of History, Political Science and Economics	SC 286-3138 904/599-3138
USF	Dr. Edward M. Silbert Associate Dean College of Social and Behavioral Sciences SOC 107	SC 574-2503 813/974-2503
FAU	Dr. Jerry Kennedy Professor Department of Anthropology	SC 238-3233 305/393-3233
UWF	Dr. Dallas Blanchard Coordinator, Sociology Department, and Associate Professor, Anthropology Building 13	SC 680-2797 904/474-2797
UCF	Dr. Ronald Wallace Dept. of Sociology and Anthroplogy Fine Arts Building Room 410	SC 345-2227 305/275-2227
FIU	Dr. Luis Escovar Associate Dean College of Arts and Sciences	SC 441-2864 305/554-2864
UNF	Dr. Richard R. Weiner Chairperson Department of Political Sciences and Sociology	SC 861-2850 904/646-2850

APPENDIX D

STATEWIDE ISSUES

STATEWIDE ISSUES INDENTIFIED
BY SOCIAL SCIENCE COORDINATORS
1987

1. Contact and interaction between the Social Sciences and professional schools.

2. The role of the Social Sciences within the university.

3. The amount of research conducted and the amount of outside funding.

4. Issues and needs related to faculty development.

5. Issues and needs related to the development of the changing student body.

APPENDIX E

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM INVENTORY

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM INVENTORY
OF
SOCIAL SCIENCE

Current Through August 1987

45.0101 Social Sciences, General (2201 or 4949)

UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
	B M	M	B	B	B	B		

45.0201 Anthropology (2202)

UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
B M D	B M D[1]		B M D	B M	B	B		

45.0501 Demography (2215)

UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
	M							

45.0801 History (2205)

UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
B M D	B M D	B	B M	B M	B M	B M	B M[6]	B M[1]

45.1101 Sociology (2208)

UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
B M D	B M D	B	B M	B M	B	B M	B	B

B = Bachelor Degree
M = Master Degree
D = Doctoral Degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)

[1] Cooperative Degree Program with existing UF program
[6] Affiliated Degree Program with existing FAU program

APPENDIX F

SITE VISIT SCHEDULES FOR INDIVIDUAL UNIVERSITIES

SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW ORIENTATION
Thursday, February 5, 1987
Collins Building, Room 210-A

9:30 - 10:30	Overview of the Program Review Process: Purpose and Procedures for the Systemwide Program Review	Dr. Angela Lupo-Anderson Director of Program Review
	Program Review Criteria	
10:30 - 11:00	Responsibilities of the University Coordinators	Dr. Denise L. Young Program Review Associate
	Responsibilities of the Lead Consultant	
	Responsibilities of the Local Consultant	
11:00 - 11:15	BREAK	
11:15 - 11:45	Selection of Candidates for Lead Consultants in History, Sociology, and Anthropology	Dr. Denise L. Young Program Review Associate
11:45 - 12:15	Self Study Format	Dr. Denise L. Young Program Review Associate
12:15 - 1:00	Introduction the SUS	Dr. Roy E. McTarnaghan Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs
	LUNCH	
1:00 - 1:30	Discussion of Primary Concerns and Issues for the Social Science Program Review	Dr. Angela Lupo-Anderson Director, Program Review
1:30 - 1:45	Data Needs for Program Review	Dr. Bruce Mitchell, Dir. of Research Services
1:45 - 2:00	Equal Opportunity Employment: Concerns and Trends in the State University System	Ms. Lillie Shelton, Dir. of Equal Opportunity Prog.
2:00 - 2:15	State University System Goals	Ms. Margaret Edwards Assistant in Planning
2:15 - 2:30	Community Colleges and the Program Review	Dr. Christine Burton Division of Community Colleges
2:30 - 3:00	Unfinished Business and Adjournment	

ORIENTATION OF CONSULTANTS
SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1987, 9:30 AM - 3:30 PM
COLLINS BUILDING, ROOM 309

9:30	WELCOME; The SUS and The Academic Programs Office	Dr. Roy McTarnaghan, Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs
10:00	Program Review; The Social Science Review Issues	Dr. Art Gallaher, BOR Lead Consultant
10:45	Break	
11:00	SUS Budgets	Dr. George Perkins, Associate Vice Chancellor for Budgets
11:30	Lunch and Outline of the Report and Timeline of Events	Dr. Angela Lupo-Anderson, Director of Program Review and Dr. Denise L. Young, Program Review Associate
1:30	Community Colleges	Mr. Dave Ehlert, Educational Policy Analyst Programs Support Services
1:45	Post-Secondary Education Planning Commission	Dr. Carolyn Herrington, Educational Policy Director, PEPC
2:00	Collective Bargaining	Mr. Jim Parry, Director, Office of Human Resources
3:00	Adjourn	

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE

Thursday, March 26, 1987

BOR Consultants meet with President Sliger, Provost Turnbull, etc., at 9 AM.

Local consultants for Sociology, Anthropology, and (it is hoped) History make their site visit this day; will need to meet with Chair, graduate and undergraduate directors, other key faculty, maybe all faculty, selection of students, alumni and employers if available and deemed appropriate; plus perhaps Dean Baum.

The BOR consultant (for sociology, Russell Dynes) will make his site visit for demography on Thursday morning, after the meeting with the administration, approximately 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. He, together with the local demography consultant, will need to meet with the same people as listed above for the local demography consultant on Wednesday late afternoon. This should end with a bag lunch brought in to Bellamy, after which the consultants get half an hour or so together on their own to compare notes and outline their report and conclusions.

Friday, March 27, 1987

The site visit by the BOR consultants for Sociology, Anthropology, and (it is hoped) History will occur on Friday 27 March. This will start with a meeting for Anthropology and History consultants and chairs with Dean Baum at 9 a.m. (already scheduled through Janet Horton, tentatively to 9:45 a.m.). The Sociology consultants will meet with Dr. Cobbe and Dr. Hazelrigg at the same time. The objective for this first meeting is to review "goals and objectives of the disciplines and programs within the college and departments".

Thereafter the suggested schedule goes as follows:

10:00 - 11:00	Characteristics of programs, adequacy of resources, relationship to university mission and state needs, aspirations for programs.	Department Chair and key faculty
11:00 - 11:15	Break	
11:15 - 12:00	"Extrinsic value of program"	Alumni, employers of alumni, other "consumers" of the program [if this does not appear feasible, we can skip or substitute].

12:00 - 1:00	Lunch [brought in] and discussion of programs	Consultants only
1:00 - 2:00	Characteristics of students, faculty specializations, curriculum, instruction, research, service, admissions, retention, follow-up on program graduates, community college and public school interaction and cooperation, community resources.	Department chairs and key faculty
2:00 - 2:15	Break	
2:15 - 3:15	Review student work, interview students, review specialized facilities supporting program	Selection of students with cross-section of characteristics by level, race, sex, background.
3:15 - 4:00	Break and discussion of programs, conclusions	Consultants only
4:00 - 5:00	Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations to the university.	Provost Turnbull, consultants, possibly others TBA.

The above can be adapted as need be so long as the major elements are present. Please start ensuring that the necessary "key faculty" are identified and available, thinking about where to meet, identifying students, etc. It probably makes sense to keep the lunch period at the same fixed time for all, so all 6 or 7 consultants can get together in one place then (and at 3). Note that the schedule has them coming to FSU first.

UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA
SOCIOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY, SOCIAL SCIENCES (INTERDISCIPLINARY)
April 10, 1987

Board Rm/Bldg 10		
8:30 - 9:00	Priority of disciplines in the university and availability of Resources in disciplines	President, Academic VP Associate Vice Pres.
9:00 - 9:45	Goals & Objectives of disciplines and programs within the college and departments	Associate VP, Dean, Chair, Coordinators
9:45 - 10:00	Break	
Bldg. 13/Rm 103		
10:00 - 11:00	Characteristics of programs, adequacy of resources, relationships to university mission & state needs, aspirations for the programs	Department, program chairs, key faculty
11:00 - 11:15	Break	
11:15 - 12:00	Extrinsic value of programs	Alumni, employers of alumni, and other consumers of programs
12:00 - 1:00	LUNCH - FOUNDATION ROOM/LIBRARY	Consultants only
Bldg. 13/Rm 103		
1:00 - 2:00	Characteristics of students, faculty specializations, curriculum, instruction, research service, admissions, retention, follow-up on graduates, community colleges & public school interaction & cooperation, community resources	Department or program chairs, key faculty
2:00 - 2:15	Break	
2:15 - 3:00	Review student work, interview students, review specialized facilities supporting programs	Cross-section of students by sex, race, background
Board Rm/Bldg 10		
3:00 - 3:45	Break & Discussion of programs	Consultants only
3:45 - 4:45	Summary of findings & preliminary recommendations to the university	President, Academic VP Associate VP, Deans, Chair, Coordinators

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
March 31, 1987

Consultants arrive on Tampa Campus at 8:15 a.m.

8:30 - 9:00 ADM 233	Priority of discipline within university and availability of resources to programs in discipline	Provost O'Brien Vice Provost Anker Asst. Provost Schenck
9:00 - 9:45 SOC 148	Goals and objectives of the discipline and programs within the college and departments.	Dean Russell Assoc. Dean Silbert Dr. Angrosino-Chair, Anthropology Dr. Kleiman-Chair, Sociology Vice Provost Newkome, Graduate School Assoc. Dean Deats, Graduate School Asst. Dean Renick, Graduate School
9:45 - 10:00	Break	
10:00 - 11:00 ADM 241	Priority of discipline within university and availability of resources to progs. in discipline	President Brown
11:00 - 11:15	Break	
11:15 - 12:00 SOC 160 SOC 255	Characteristics of programs adequacy of resources, relationships to university mission and to state needs, aspirations for program	Dr. Gallagher, Dr. Angrosino, ANT Faculty Dr. Dynes, Dr. Kleiman, SOC Faculty
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch and discussion of programs	Consultants only
1:00 - 2:00 SOC 160 SOC 255	Characteristics of students, faculty specializations, curriculum, instruction, research, service admissions, retention, follow up on program graduates, community college and public school interaction and cooperation, community resources	Dr. Gallaher, Dr. Angrosino, ANT Faculty Dr. Dynes, Dr. Kleiman, SOC Faculty

(Continued)

2:00 - 2:15	Break	
2:15 - 3:00 SOC 146 SOC 255	Extrinsic value of programs to Community: Employers, Alumni	Dr. Gallaher, ANT Alumni, Employers, etc. Dr. Dynes, SOC Alumni, Employers, etc.
SOC 146 SOC 255	Review student work, interview students, review specialized facilities supporting programs.	A selection of students with cross-section of characteristics by level, race, sex, background.
3:00 - 3:50 SOC 102	Break and Discussion of programs	Consultants only
4:00 - 5:30 ADM 233	Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations to the university.	Provost O'Brien Vice Provost Anker Dean Russell Assoc. Dean Silbert Dr. Angrosino Dr. Kleiman (President Brown if schedule permits)

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
FINAL ITINERARY FOR
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
IN ANTHROPOLOGY
April 1, 1987

8:30 - 9:15	President's Office, Administration Building
	Priority of discipline within university and availability of resources to program in discipline.
	Dr. Colbourn, President Dr. Juge, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
9:15 - 10:15	Board Room, Administration Building
	Goals and objectives of the discipline and programs within the college and university.
	Dr. Rollins, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences Dr. Fabianic, Chair, Sociology and Anthropology
10:15 - 10:30	Break
10:30 - 12:00	Board Room, Administration Building
	Characteristics of programs, adequacy of resources, relationships to university mission and to state needs, aspirations for program.
	Faculty: Dr. Jones, Dr. Stearman, Dr. Wallace
12:00 - 1:00	Board Room
	Lunch
1:00 - 2:30	Board Room
	Students
2:30 - 2:45	Break
2:45 - 3:45	Discussion, work, other
	Consultants
3:45 - 4:45	President's Office
	Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations to the university.
	President, Associate Vice President, Dean, Chair

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
FINAL ITINERARY FOR
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
IN SOCIOLOGY
April 1, 1987

8:30 - 9:15	President's Office, Administration Building
	Priority of discipline within university and availability of resources to program in discipline.
	Dr. Colbourn, President Dr. Juge, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
9:15 - 10:15	Board Room, Administration Building
	Goals and objectives of the discipline and programs within the college and university.
	Dr. Rollins, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences Dr. Fabianic, Chair, Sociology and Anthropology
10:15 - 10:30	Break
10:30 - 12:00	Board Room, Administration Building
	Characteristics of programs, adequacy of resources, relationships to university mission and to state needs, aspirations for program.
	Faculty: Dr. Allen, Dr. Bridges, Dr. Hodgin
12:00 - 1:00	Board Room
	Lunch
1:00 - 1:15	Board Room
	ASA Honors Program, Dr. Burton Wright, Professor Emeritus
1:15 - 2:15	Faculty: Dr. Unkovic, Dr. Cook
2:15 - 2:45	Students
2:45 - 3:00	Break
3:00 - 3:45	Discussion
3:45 - 4:45	President's Office
	Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations to the university. President, Associate Vice President, Dean, Chair

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
HISTORY
April 8, 1987

8:30 - 9:00	Priority of discipline within university and availability of resources to program in discipline President Colbourn's Office	President Trevor Colbourn and Vice President Richard Astro
9:00 - 9:45	Goals and objectives of the discipline and programs within the college and departments. Dean's Conference Room Humanities & Fine Arts, Room 516	Dean Jack B. Rollins, Department Chair, Jerrell Shofner and Dean of Graduate Studies, Louis Trefonas
9:45 - 10:00	Break	
10:00 - 11:00	Extrinsic value of program Dean's Conference Room	Alumni
11:00 - 12:00	Characteristics of programs adequacy of resources, relationships to university mission and to state needs, aspirations for program. Dean's Conference Room	Jerrell Shofner and faculty
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch and discussion of programs Dean's Conference Room	Consultants only
1:00 - 2:00	Characteristics of students, faculty specializations, curriculum, instruction, research, service, admissions, retention, follow-up on program graduates, community college and	Jerrell Shofner

	public school interaction and cooperation, community resources Dean's Conference Room	
2:00 - 2:15	Break	
2:15 - 3:00	Review student work, interview students, review specialized facilities supporting program. Dean's Conference Room	A selection of students with cross-section of characteristics by level, race, sex, background.
3:00 - 3:45	Break and Discussion of programs Dean's Conference Room	Consultants only
3:45 - 4:45	Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations to the university. President Colbourn's Office	Trevor Colbourn, Richard Astro, Jack Rollins, Louis Trefonas, and Jerrell Shofner

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
HISTORY DEPARTMENT
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
April 9, 1987

Consultants arrive on Tampa Campus at 8:15 a.m.

8:30 - 9:00 (ADM 233)	Priority of discipline within university and availability of resources to programs in discipline.	Provost O'Brien Vice Provost Anker Asst. Provost Schenck
9:00 - 9:30 (ADM 241)	Priority of discipline within university and availability of resources to programs in discipline.	President Brown
9:30 - 9:45	Break	
9:45 - 10:30 (SOC 255)	Goals and objectives of the discipline and programs within the college and departments.	Dean Russell Assoc. Dean Silbert Dr. Swanson-Chair, History Vice Provost Newkome, Graduate School Assoc. Dean Deats, Graduate School Asst. Dean Renick, Graduate School
10:30 - 10:45	Break	
10:45 - 12:00 (SOC 273)	Characteristics of programs, adequacy of resources, relationships to university mission and to state needs, aspirations for program	Dr. Stephens, Dr. Swanson, History Faculty
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch and discussion of programs	Consultants only
1:00 - 2:00 (SOC 273)	Characteristics of students, faculty specializations, curriculum, instruction, research, service admissions, retention, follow-up on program graduates, community college and public school interaction and cooperation, community resources	Dr. Stephens, Dr. Swanson, History Faculty

(Continued)

2:00 - 2:15	Break	
2:15 - 3:00 (SOC 273)	Extrinsic value of programs to Community: Employers, Alumni	Dr. Stephens, History Alumni, Employers, etc.
	Review student work, interview students, review specialized facilities supporting programs.	A selection of students with cross-section of characteristics by level, race, sex, background.
3:00 - 3:50 (SOC 102)	Break and Discussion of programs.	Consultants only
4:00 - 5:30 (ADM 233)	Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations to the university.	Provost O'Brien Vice Provost Anker Dean Russell Assoc. Dean Silbert Dr. Swanson (President Brown if his schedule permits)

UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA
SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW
(HISTORY)
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
April 10, 1987

Board Rm/Bldg 10		
9:00- 9:30	Priority of disciplines in the university and availaibility of resources in disciplines	President, Academic VP Associate Vice Pres.
9:30- 9:45	Goals & objectives of disciplines and programs within the college and departments	Associate VP, Dean, Chair
Bldg. 50/Rm 221		
10:00-11:00	Characteristics of programs, adequacy of resourcs, relationships to univ. mission & state needs, aspirations for the programs	Department, program chairs, key faculty
11:00-11:15	Break	
11:15-12:00	Extrinsic value of program	Alumni, employers of alumni, and other consumers of programs
12:00- 1:00	LUNCH - FOUNDATION ROOM/LIBRARY	Consultants only
1:00- 2:00	Characteristics of students, faculty specializations, curriculum, instruction, research service, admissions, retention, followup on graduates, community colleges & public school interaction & cooperation, community resources	Department or program chairs, key faculty
2:00- 2:15	Break	
2:15- 3:00	Review student work, interview students, review specialized facilities supporting programs	Cross-section of students by sex, race background
3:00- 3:30	Break & Discussion of programs	Consultants only
Presidents' Office/Bldg 10		
4:00- 4:45	Summary of findings & preliminary recommendations to the university	President, Academic VP Associate VP, Deans, Chair

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
April 20, 1987, 8:00 AM-4:45 PM

8:00 - 8:30 AM	Pick up consultants-Orient to University	Program Coordinator
8:30 - 9:00 AM (ADM 340)	Priority of discipline within university and availability of resources to program in discipline.	President and/or Academic Vice President
9:00 - 9:45 AM (ADM 340)	Goals and objectives of the discipline and programs within the college and departments	Academic Dean and Department Chairs, Dean Graduate Studies
9:45 - 10:00 AM	Break	
10:00 - 11:00 AM ADM 216 - ANTH ADM 283 - SOC HU 151 - HIST	Characteristics of programs adequacy of resources, relationships to university mission and to state needs, aspirations for program.	Department or Program Chairs and Key Faculty
11:00 - 11:15 AM	Break	
11:15 - 12:00 (ADM 340)	Extrensic value of program	Alumni, Employers of Alumni and Other Consumers of Program
12:00 - 1:00 PM (ADM 340)	Lunch and discussion of programs	Consultants only
1:00 - 2:00 PM ADM 216 - ANTH ADM 283 - SOC HU 151 - HIST	Characteristics of students, faculty specializations, curriculum, instruction, research, service, admissions, retention, follow-up on program graduates, community college and public school interaction and cooperation, community resources	Department or Program Chairs and Key Faculty
2:00 - 2:15 PM	Break	
2:15 - 3:00 PM (ADM 208)	Review student work, interview students, review specialized facilities supporting program	A selection of students with cross-section of characteristics by level, race, sex, background

(Continued)

3:00 - 3:45 PM (ADM 340)	Break and discussion of program	Consultants only
3:45 - 4:45 PM (ADM 340)	Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations to the university	President, Academic Vice President, Deans, Department Chairs

** Please note that ADM 208 and ADM 340 are available for the Social Science Program Review consultants the entire day.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
SOCIAL SCIENCES PROGRAM REVIEW
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
April 21, 1987

Time & Room #	Topics for Discussion	University & BOR Repres
8:30 - 9:00 PC 521	Priority of discipline within University and availability of resources to program in discipline	Pres. Modesto Maidique, Academic Vice President Paul Gallagher, Graduate Dean Richard Campbell, Dr. Art Gallagher, Dr. Russell R. Dynes, Dr. Lester Stephens, Dr. Carl Prince and Dr. Charles Ragin
9:00 - 9:45 DM 223	Goals and objectives of the discipline and programs within the College and departments	Academic Dean, James Mau, Assoc. Deans Luis Escovar and Art Herriott, Chairpersons Howard Rock and Lisandro Perez, Dr. Art Gallagher, Dr. Russell Dynes, Dr. Lester Stephens, Dr. Carl Prince and Dr. Charles Ragin
9:45 - 10:00	Break	
10:00 - 11:00 DM 223 and DM 440	Characteristics of programs adequacy of resources, relationships to University mission and to state needs, aspirations for program	Chairperson Howard Rock, History faculty, Dr. Lester Stephens and Dr. Carl Prince in DM 440 Chairperson Lisandro Perez, Sociology/ Anhtropology faculty, Dr. Art Gallagher, Dr. Russell Dynes and Dr. Charles Ragin in DM 223
11:00 - 11:15	Break	
11:15 - 12:00 DM 223 and DM 440	Extrinsic value of program	Alumni, Employers of Alumni, and Other Consumers of the Programs History (DM 440) and Sociology/Anthropology (DM 223)

FIU (Continued)
Site Visit Schedule

Time & Room #	Topics for Discussion	University & BOR Repres
12:00 - 1:00 DM 440	Lunch and discussion of programs	Consultants only
1:00 - 2:00 DM 223 and DM 440	Characteristics of students, faculty specializations, curriculum, instruction, research, service, admissions, retention, follow-up on program graduates, community college and public school interaction and cooperation, community resources	Chairperson Howard Rock, History faculty, Dr. Lester Stephens and Dr. Carl Prince in DM 440 Chairperson Lisandro Perez, Sociology/ Anthropology faculty, Dr. Art Gallagher, Dr. Russell Dynes and Dr. Charles Ragin in DM 223
2:00 - 2:15	Break	
2:15 - 3:00 DM 223 and DM 440	Review student work, interview students, review specialized facilities supporting program	A selection of students with cross-section of characteristics by level, race, sex, background History (DM 440) and Sociology/Anthropology (DM 223)
3:00 - 3:45 DM 440	Break and Discussion of programs	Consultants only
3:45 - 4:45 PC 521	Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations to the University	President Maidique, Vice President Gallagher, Dean Mau, Assoc. Deans Escovar and Herriott, Chairpersons Rock and Perez, Dr. Gallagher, Dr. Dynes, Dr. Stephens, Dr. Prince and Dr. Ragin

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA
REGENTS REVIEW OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
(SOCIOLOGY, HISTORY)
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
BOTH LEAD CONSULTANTS & LOCAL CONSULANTS

Wednesday, April 22, 1987

9:00 - 9:45 a.m.	Dr. Curtis McCray, President of UNF; and Dr. John Bardo, Vice President of Academic Affairs	Role of Disciplines Within the University and Availability of Rescurce to Program
9:45 - 10:00 a.m.	Dr. Rich Weiner, Interim Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences	
10:00 - 10:30 a.m.	Dr. Edward Healy, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of College of Arts & Sciences (1983-1987)	
10:30 - 11:00 a.m.	Dr. Joyce Jones, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and Director, Sponsored Research	
11:00 - 11:30 a.m.*	Coordinators of Program Reviews (Dr. Weiner-Sociology, Dr. Crooks-History) & Chairpersons of Respective Departments (Dr. Weiner, Sociology & Political Sciences; Dr. Schafer, History & Philosophy)	
11:30 - 12:15 p.m.	Meet with Students and Alumni	
12:15 - 12:45 p.m.	Meet with Faculty	
1:00 - 2:00 p.m.*	Working Lunch for Board Staff & Consultants	
2:00 - 3:00 p.m.	Tour Library, Department Facilities, and Student Work	
3:00 - 4:00 p.m.*	Wrap-Up Session (Board Staff and Consultants)	
4:00 - 5:00 p.m.*	Exit Interview (President and Vice President of Academic Affairs)	

* President's Conference Room, Building 1 Room 2547

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
SCHEDULE FOR SUS ANTHROPOLOGY SITE VISIT
Thursday, April 23, 1987
Drs. Art Gallaher and Tom Greaves

8:15 a.m.	Met at hotel by Art Hansen and taken to Tigert Hall.
8:30 - 9:00	Cappy Longstreth, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs (239 Tigert) and consultants for history and political science. Discuss priority of disciplines within university and availability of resources.
9:00 - 9:45	Charles Sidman, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Madelyn Lockhart, Dean, Graduate School (2014 A Turlington) with consultants for history and political science. Discuss goals, objectives, and resources of the college, graduate program, disciplines, and programs.
9:45 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 10:30	Marvin Harris, Graduate Research Professor, Anthropology, and Ron Cohen, Professor, Anthropology (451 Grinter). Discuss characteristics of department and programs, adequacy of resources, relationships to college, university, state, and national needs, aspirations and priorities.
10:30 - 11:00	Hunt Davis, Director, Center for African Studies, and Terry McCoy, Director, Center for Latin American Studies (472 Grinter). Discuss linkages of department with centers and, through center programs, with other campus units.
11:00 - 11:15	Break
11:15 - 12 Noon	Interested Anthropology Faculty (472 Grinter). Continue discussion begun with Harris and Cohen.
12:00 - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch with other consultants (2014 Turlington). Discuss departments, programs, and university.
1:00 - 2:00	Self-Evaluation Committee: Paul Doughty, Professor, Anthropology, Otto von Mering, Professor, Anthropology, and Linda Wolfe, Assistant Professor, Anthropology (B364 Turlington). Discuss continuing self-evaluation. Continue discussion begun with Harris and Cohen.
2:00 - 2:15	Tour the basement and departmental office.

2:15 - 3:00	Interested Anthropology Graduate Students (1350, or 2014 Turlington if too many to fit in 1350). Discuss discipline, department, programs, and curriculum. Interview students about characteristics, specializations, and career plans.
3:00 - 3:45	Break and discussion of disciplines and programs (2014 Turlington).
3:45 - 4:45	Cappy Longstreth, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Charles Sidman, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Departmental Chairs. Present and discuss summary of findings and preliminary recommendations to the university.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
SCHEDULE FOR SUS HISTORY SITE VISIT
April 23, 1987

8:30 - 9:00 a.m.	Gene W. Hemp, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, 233 Tigert Hall
9:00 - 9:45	Charles F. Sidman, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Madelyn Lockhart, Dean, Graduate School, Felix Berardo, Chair, Sociology, Russell Bernard, Chair, Anthropology, and David Colburn, Chair, History, 2014 Turlington Hall
9:45 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 11:30	David Colburn, Chair, Robert Hatch, Associate Chair, George Pozzetta, Graduate Coordinator, Geoffrey Giles, Undergraduate Coordinator, 4131 Turlington Hall.
11:30 - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch with group of faculty
1:00 - 2:00	BOR Committee - David Chalmers, Fred Gregory, R. Hunt Davis
2:00 - 2:45	Meeting with Graduate Students
2:45 - 3:00	Break
3:00 - 3:45	Consultants Only
3:45 - 5:00	Gene Hemp, Charles F. Sidman, Felix Berardo, Russell Bernard, David Colburn

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
SOCIOLOGY - SITE VISIT SCHEDULE

Lead Consultant - Russell Dynes
University of Delaware

Local Consultant - John Clark
University of Minnesota

April 23, 1987

8:30 - 9:00	Priority of disciplines within university and availability of resources to program in discipline	President and/or Academic Vice President
9:00 - 9:45	Goals and objectives of the discipline and programs within college and departments	Academic Dean and Department Chairs, Dean Graduate Studies
9:45 - 10:00	Break	
10:00 - 11:00	Characteristics of program adequacy of resources, relationships to university mission and to state needs, aspirations for programs	Department or Program Chairs and Key Faculty Berardo, Department Chair Self-Study Committee Frazier (Chair) La Greca Vandiver
11:15 - 12:00	Extrinsic value of program	Faculty with Interdisciplinary connections with Centers, Programs, etc.
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch and discussion of programs	Box lunch in 2014 TURL
1:00 - 2:00	Characteristics of students, faculty specializations, curriculum, instruction, research, service, admissions, retention, follow-up on program graduates, community college and public school interaction and cooperation, community resources	Berardo, Department Chair Vandiver: Graduate Coordinator Radelet: Undergraduate Coordinator Frazier: TA Coordinator Akers: Internship Coord. Vera: Honors Coordinator Gorman: Undergraduate Advisor Beeghley: Undergraduate Adivsor

Sociology - Site Visit
(Continued)

2:00 - 2:15	Break	
2:15 - 3:00	Review student work, interview students, review specialized facilities supporting program	Cross-section of undergraduate and graduate students
3:00 - 3:45	Break and Discussion of programs	Consultants only
3:45 - 4:45	Summary of findings and prelimnary recommendations to the university	President, Academic Vice President, Deans, Department Chairs

FLORIDA A & M UNIVERSITY
SOCIAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW
SITE VISIT SCHEDULED
April 24, 1987

8:30 - 9:00	Priority of discipline with university and availability of resources to programs in discipline.	Dr. Richard Hogg Vice President for Academic Affairs. OFFICE: Foote-Hilyer Building
9:00 - 9:45	Goals and objectives of the discipline and programs within the college and departments	Dr. Aubrey M. Perry, Dean College of Arts & Sciences Dr. Charles U. Smith, Dean School of Graduate Studies and Continuing Education Dr. Victoria E. Warner Chairperson, Sociology, Social Welfare & Criminal Justice Dr. Grace R. Maxwell Coordinator, Masters of Applied Social Science Program Dr. Larry E. Rivers Chairman, History, Political Science and Economics Room 113 Tucker Hall
9:45 -10:00	Break	Room 113 Tucker Hall
10:00-11:00	Characteristics of programs adequacy of resources, relationships to university mission and to state needs, aspirations for program.	Dr. Victoria Warner Dr. Larry Rivers Dr. Grace Maxwell Room 113 Tucker Hall
11:00-11:15	Break	
11:15-12:00	Extrinsic value of program	Alumni, Employers of Alumni and other consumers of the program History and Social Science Program Room 113 Tucker Hall Sociology Room 210-A Tucker Hall
12:00- 1:00	Lunch and discussion of programs	Consultants - Room 113

FAMU (Continued)

1:00- 2:00	Characteristics of students, faculty specializations, curriculum, instruction, research, service, admissions, retention, follow up on program graduates, community college and public school interaction and cooperation, community resources	History/Social Science Chairman Coordinator Faculty Room 113 Tucker Hall Sociology Chairperson Faculty Room 210-A Tucker Hall
2:00- 2:15	Break	
2:15- 3:00	Review student work, interview students, review specialized facilities supporting program.	History/Social Science Room 113 Tucker Hall
3:00- 3:15	Break	
3:15- 3:45	Discussion of programs (Consultants Only)	Room 113 Tucker Hall
3:45- 4:45	Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations to the university	History/Social Science Sociology Dr. Richard Hogg Dr. Aubrey M. Perry Dr. Charles U. Smith Dr. Victoria Warner Dr. Grace Maxwell Dr. Larry Rivers Room 113 Tucker Hall

APPENDIX G

STAFF ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Accepted by BOR 8/26/87

PROGRAM REVIEW OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
STAFF ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Social Science program review concentrated upon four disciplines--anthropology, sociology, history, and demography. The general and interdisciplinary social sciences were also included. A lead consultant was selected for each of the three major discipline areas. Dr. Art Gallaher, Chancellor, University of Kentucky, reviewed anthropology; Dr. Lester Stephens, Department Head, University of Georgia, reviewed History, and Dr. Russell Dynes, Professor, University of Delaware, reviewed sociology. Dr. Gallaher served as the lead for the team and also assumed responsibility for the Demography and General and Interdisiplinary Social Science reports.

The universities appointed "local" consultants (nationally known, out-of-state experts) in each of the disciplines. The site visits often occurred on the same day, but a separate review was conducted for each discipline. The effort was coordinated by Dr. Denise L. Young of the BOR Program Review staff.

The report includes six sections: Introduction to Social Science; Anthropology; History; Sociology; Demography; and, General and Interdisciplinary Social Science. Recommendations appear at the end of each section, with the exception of general and interdisciplinary social science, which reports the structure and requirements of each program. The following staff analysis highlights the central issues in the social sciences in the SUS and includes

recommendations for BOR action and university action for each discipline. The recommendations for individual institutions appear in the full report.

Introduction to Social Science

Since the early 1970's our society has shifted from a social science emphasis to an equally obsessive concern with reasserting our technological dominance in the world community. Unlike previous industrial revolutions, which were workforce and natural resource driven, this one is driven by knowledge. Indeed, the management of knowledge and its control is emerging as the major commodity in contemporary human societies. The conversion of information to knowledge is a major responsibility of the modern university. It is against this background that the consultants examined the selected disciplines in social science in the SUS in 1987.

Social Science-The Undergraduate Experience

The Regents should take considerable credit and much pride in the document entitled the Quest for Excellence: The Master Plan. This document delineates major trends in the state, some of which are extensions of idiosyncratic history, and are perceived, therefore, to be unique; others, rooted in the present, are nurtured by events in the nation; and a smaller number take their import from the international community. Whatever their origin, the identification of such trends is an excellent benchmark against which to assess the efficacy of general studies programs in the state's system of higher education.

It is worthy to note that the local and lead consultants found there is too little effort in Florida institutions to conceptualize general education models that will meet contemporary students' needs. There is a need to

accelerate modification of existing programs, especially on the need for innovation that more explicitly anticipates the future needs of the students. Further, the consultants believe it is difficult to manage general education effectively in a predominantly 2 + 2 system where experiential integration depends on substantive congruity and quality of courses.

The Master Plan mentions in several places the perceived need for Florida students to develop an appreciation for cultural diversity, both for the pragmatic reasons of international business and for the practical reasons of living in a multicultural society. The consultants support this goal and believe it should receive attention in both general studies and baccalaureate programs. They note that the disciplines under review should have major responsibility for understanding and communicating the socio-cultural and historical context of these programs. Of particular concern to the consultants in this regard, is the low profile of anthropology and sociology in some existing core and/or general studies curricula. They need special attention in a system that espouses cultural diversity and social and cultural pluralism as legitimate enterprises and this should be corrected.

The social sciences are being reasonably well taught on all campuses in the State University System and the baccalaureate programs meet with both special and casual interest. The consultants are concerned that the service expectations of some small-faculty disciplinary units cause them to be over taxed, which creates a situation that may possibly damage the integrity of the baccalaureate program.

Social Science: The Graduate Experience

The number and variety of graduate programs in all these disciplines is adequate to meet both market and student demand, with no significant duplicative efforts that are not justified by circumstance or program level. The current SUS situation calls for fine-tuning existing programs rather than considering expansion at either the M.A. or Ph.D. levels.

There are many issues that the consultants believe to be of special concern at the state level. One of the most important issues is the impact of access. The practical implications of the compulsion to offer programs in many sites, particularly at the graduate level, are over-extension of faculty where some units and programs are already understaffed, and creation of programs which, under present conditions, the state cannot afford and for which there is not demand.

Recommendations

BOR Action

1. That the BOARD OF REGENTS not encourage further development of inter-university graduate degree programs in the social sciences;
2. That the BOARD OF REGENTS not encourage the development of social science programs or services courses at branch campuses without the infusion of resources to maintain them, thus averting the drain of funds from existing programs and campuses;
3. No program action is recommended for implementation of new programs in anthropology, history, and sociology at any level as a result of this program review. The joint PEPC-BOR committee which is responsible for planning new program implementation in Southeast Florida should reconsider the original timelines for programs in these social

sciences. In light of the recommendations in the report, it may be advisable to move them to the out years of the plan;

4. That the BOARD OF REGENTS develop system-wide programs for faculty renewal and development;

5. That the BOARD OF REGENTS initiate a feasibility study for the development of a multidisciplinary ethnic relations center in the Southeast Florida region; and,

6. That the BOARD OF REGENTS ask the universities to examine their staffing in the social sciences and take steps to assure there are enough faculty to deliver a quality undergraduate and graduate program. The consultants found many programs to be stretched in their efforts to offer service courses, meet Gordon Rule demands, maintain a viable major, and service branch campuses and sites.

University Action

1. During the 1987 revision of the SUS Master Plan, the Universities should review and incorporate the recommendations of the Criser Report on the Undergraduate Enhancement, the Social Science program review, and the current Master Plan Goals in developing/modifying their general education curriculum.

Anthropology

BOR Action

1. That the BOARD OF REGENTS strengthen existing programs rather than initiate new ones;
2. That the BOARD OF REGENTS not approve any new graduate programs in the near future. If demand for a new program arises in the 1990's, FSU should be considered as the university most able to implement such a program;
3. That the BOARD OF REGENTS not encourage joint-institution Ph.D program effort; and,
4. That the BOARD OF REGENTS terminate the Masters of Anthropology in Teaching (M.A.T.) at UF since the program is no longer offered.

History

BOR Action

1. No new Ph.D. program in history should be introduced in the near future, with the possible exception of USF. If the current market continues, no new programs should be introduced because this would almost certainly guarantee a reduction in the demand for the existing programs at FSU and UF.

University Action

1. Each institution, especially the new ones, should clarify and articulate fully its expectations regarding the role of teaching, scholarly productivity, and service in the faculty's overall load, so that the faculty know clearly what they should be doing.

Sociology

BOR Action

1. Given the adequate coverage of sociology as reflected in the diverse institutions within the SUS, that future emphasis should be to strengthen existing programs rather than the initiation of new ones; and,
2. That new graduate programs not be initiated with the possible exception of FIU (within guidelines provided in the institutional sociology section), even though there may be significant local pressures to do so.

University Action

1. That the undergraduate major programs in sociology be maintained and strengthened.